

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

reserve
A289.9
V59

X
REPORT OF

1 9 6 7

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

MAY 18 1967

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS



April 20 and 21, 1967 X

HOTEL VERMONT

BURLINGTON, VERMONT

REPORT OF 1967 STATE ASCS CONFERENCE

Vermont State and County Committeemen, County Office Managers,
County Agents, and Guests

Held at Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, April 20 and 21, 1967

Foreword

This report presents the highlights of the talks and actions taken at the 1967 State ASCS Conference. This, our 29th conference of county committeemen and county office managers, was held to discuss some of the changes which have taken place in ASCS programs over the years. These changes have been made to meet changing conditions in agriculture. Ways and means of doing a better job and to help make a better Vermont were discussed by speakers and those attending the conference.

A real highlight of this year's conference was the illustrated talk on Venezuelan agriculture, given by B. Frank Myott, former State Committeeman. This talk gave us a better understanding of some of the problems in Latin America and provided food for thought as to how we can best aid our neighbors to the South.

The conference sessions and the banquet were well attended by county committeemen, county office managers and persons representing the various cooperating agencies.

We appreciate very much the work and wholehearted cooperation of everyone who helped in any way to make our 1967 State ASCS Conference a success.

State ASC Committee

Richard A. Moore, Chairman
J. Paul Bonneau, Member
Morris E. LaFrance, Member
Robert P. Davison, Ex Officio

State ASCS Office

A. F. Heald, State Executive Director
George T. Hart, Fieldman
Edson E. Gifford, Jr., Fieldman

A CHANGING VERMONT

The above title, while not the official theme of this year's conference, probably best describes the net effect on those attending.

The talks given by the officials of the State agencies, as well as the officials of Federal agencies operating in Vermont, accentuated the importance of the rapid changes in land use and the future of farming in Vermont.

Those attending this conference came away with a much better understanding of the growing demands on the land of this Nation to meet the need for the production of food and fiber, watershed protection, and outdoor recreation required by a growing population with an increased amount of leisure time.

PROGRAM

1967 STATE ASCS CONFERENCE

April 20 and 21, 1967

HOTEL VERMONT, BURLINGTON, VERMONT

First Day

9:00 a.m. Register, get name tags and banquet
to tickets at Conference Registration
10:00 a.m. Desk in Lobby

Conference Opened by
Morris E. LaFrance, Presiding

10:00 a.m. Conference Goals Richard A. Moore
Chairman, State
ASC Committee

10:15 a.m. Some Challenges to Committeemen Bruce Whitenight
Deputy Director,
NE Area, ASCS

Questions and Answers

Recess Milk Break

11:15 a.m. Working Together To Develop Vermont's Natural Resources Forrest Orr
Director, Interagency
Committee on Natural
Resources, Vermont

Questions and Answers

12:00 noon Lunch

4
First Day (Continued)

J. Paul Bonneau, Presiding

1:30 p.m. Working With Others

A	Extension Service	William Stone Supervisor and Program Leader
B	Soil Conservation Service	David Grimwood State Conservationist
C	Farmers Home Administration	Keith Wortman District Supervisor

Recess Milk Break

D	State Forest Service	Robert Farrington, Asst. Director of Forests
E	State Fish and Game Service	Edward Kehoe Commissioner
F	State Department of Agriculture	Robert Branon Commissioner

Questions and Answers
After each speaker

4:45 p.m. Adjourn

CONFERENCE BANQUET

6:30 p.m.

Toastmaster -- Lemuel J. Peet
Former State Conservationist

PROGRAM

Musical Selections - Four In Accord

Recognition of County Committeemen
and Others

Farming in Venezuela - B. Frank Myott
Former State
Committeeman

Second Day

Morris E. LaFrance, Presiding

9:30 a.m. Looking Ahead in ACP

Everett H. F. Felber
Director, Farmer
Programs Division, ASCS

Questions and Answers

10:15 a.m. Current Defense Activities

A. F. Heald
State Executive
Director, ASCS
and
Richard Holmes
Deputy Director, Civil
Defense, Vermont
and
Vernon Tuxbury
Extension Rural Defense
Information Specialist

Questions and Answers

Recess Milk Break

11:20 a.m. Progress Report on RC&D Program

Jack Davis
RC&D Coordinator

Questions and Answers

12:00 noon Lunch

Richard A. Moore, Presiding

1:30 p.m. Discussion of Vermont ASCS Programs

Led by:

A ACP, CAP and CRP

A. F. Heald
State Executive
Director, ASCS

B Wool, Feed Grain and wheat

G. T. Hart
Fieldman, ASCS

C County Elections and
Optical Scanning

E. E. Gifford, Jr.
Fieldman, ASCS

D County Informational Meetings

Richard A. Moore
Chairman, State
ASC Committee

3:45 p.m. Adjourn

6

CONFERENCE GOALS

by

Richard A. Moore, Chairman, Vermont State ASC Committee
at Vermont State ASCS Conference
Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont
April 20, 1967

Well, here we are again. Another year has rolled by. Welcome back. A lot of time and work have gone into planning this conference. Now it is up to you. Ask your questions and get them answered.

We have some new county committeemen here today and we issue them a special welcome.

We are glad, of course, to see so many of our old friends back. You might be interested in knowing that the records show that we have two new county committeemen this year and 156 new community committeemen.

As you know, we have just completed a series of county program planning meetings. There was excellent attendance again this year and good participation. Before the conference is over we will review some of your recommendations and discuss them.

You told us last year that you would like a conference again this year. So we went ahead and arranged it. You also said that you would like it somewhat similar to last year's. We have done that.

On your program this morning you will note that Deputy Area Director Bruce Whitenight is going to bring us up to date on the job of committeemen.

We are also glad that Forrest Orr, our new director of the Interagency Committee on Natural Resources can be with us.

This afternoon we are going to have a session with the other agency heads which we work most closely with -- Bill Stone from Extension; David Grimwood from SCS, and Keith Wortman from FHA. They will be followed by Bob Farrington, Assistant Director of Forests; Ed Kehoe, Commissioner of the Fish and Game Service; and Bob Branon, Vermont Commissioner of Agriculture. There will be plenty of time to question them about their programs.

At our banquet tonight Frank Myott, former State Committeeman, will tell us about his recent trip to Venezuela.

Tomorrow we will hear a discussion on Defense Activities by Al Heald, Dick Holmes, and Vern Tuxbury.

We are happy to have our old friend, Ev Felber, with us to bring us up to date on ACP.

Then we will hear from Jack Davis, our new RC&D Project director.

During the afternoon session the State Office crew will discuss current events on programs which they are working on.

I want to repeat that the success of our conference depends on you. Do your part. Participate in the discussions and help us do a better job.

SOME CHALLENGES TO COMMITTEEMEN

Talk by Bruce H. Whitenight, Deputy Northeast Area Director, ASCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

It is a pleasure for me to be here in Burlington for your 1967 State Conference. It's good to be back in Vermont to renew acquaintances with you fine ASCS people.

I'm here this morning to talk primarily about the farmer committee system... specifically the challenges to the farmer committee system.

I'll be using a set of slides to illustrate some of the points I want to make. But before we begin those slides, I'd like you to join with me in a little crystal ball gazing...looking into the future of agriculture.

I realize that "looking down the agricultural road" seems to be one of the more popular parlor games these days, so forgive me if some of my projections seem old hat. However, looking ahead is necessary in any business or profession, and that holds true in our work as well.

I'm sure you are all aware of a series of speeches Secretary Freeman has made recently. Entitled "Agriculture/2000", he has set forth in them what he believes will be the dominant feature of agriculture just 33 years from now.

Obviously, there is a good deal of pure speculation when we try to determine the conditions which will prevail three decades in the future. Nevertheless, many implications can be drawn from known facts.

For example, it is pretty safe to estimate that by the year 2000 there will be about 100 million more people in this country than there are today. And we know that all those additional people will inhabit the same fixed number of square miles as today, and that we will have to live from the bounty produced on the same thin layer of topsoil that feeds 200 million persons today.

It is also a relatively safe assumption, according to the experts, that population world-wide will double in the next 33 years.

The obvious question then is: Can the world feed itself? Or will hunger and degradation be the order of the day, with havenot nations pitted against the have's. No one knows the answer to that question, of course.

What we do know is what we have seen in the past. Those among us that have been associated with ASCS and its predecessor organizations for some time have noted tremendous changes in agriculture. When the AAA began some 30 years ago we note that average yearly production per milk cow was about 5,000 pounds. Today that figure is easing up toward the 10,000 pound mark.

I could go on and on with similar statistics which show production yields of many farm commodities doubling in the past 30 years. What does this mean? Will production double again by the year 2000 to help feed the world population which will have also doubled.

8

Again, no one knows what that answer will be.

What we do know with certainty, however, is that there will be increased population pressures, particularly here in the Northeast. This obviously means that you people will have to pay increased attention to the outdoor needs of urban people -- and to assist our farmers in carrying out the conservation and recreation practices necessary for a wholesome environment in a densely-populated region such as this one.

Great contributions have been made toward a more wholesome environment by our various ASCS programs. All of us should be justly proud of them. But there is much left to be done. Let's mention some "for examples".

Most of us like to do some hunting or fishing now and then. (Incidentally I was fishing for trout this past weekend in Pennsylvania.) We know how aggravating it is to constantly run across signs like the one which says -- Posted! No hunting, the sign says and I think we all know how difficult it is these days to find good, unposted hunting land.

But now sprouting up throughout the country are signs such as this one -- it announces that this land is in the Cropland Adjustment Program and hunting is permitted without charge. Programs such as these do our overall ASCS effort a great deal of good with urban people -- it gives them a feeling of freedom, knowing that on this trip no one would ask them to leave before hunting was over for the day.

At present there are over 500,000 acres of private farmland enrolled in the public access feature of the 1966 CAP. That's an impressive start and one you can all take pride in.

The public need for public access and recreation are part of what Secretary Freeman calls the "people crisis" -- a crisis which is growing more acute each day and which touches almost every American.

There are many obvious signs of this kind of "people crisis". Polluted streams and dirty air are probably the worst menace. Disfigured landscapes are evident in all too many areas, and, in general, open space is disappearing and there is a lack of recreational opportunities.

President Johnson, in a recent message to Congress, described the problem this way: "We live," he said, "with certain future of expanding populations, whose demands on the resources of nature will equal the increasing numbers. We see that we can corrupt and destroy our lands, our rivers, our forests, and the atmosphere itself -- all in the name of progress and necessity. Such a course," he added, "leads to a barren America, bereft of its beauty, and shorn of its sustenance."

Today, our ASCS programs are helping to alleviate the problems of the "people crisis". And at the same time they contribute greatly to the preservation of our natural resources.

Administrator Godfrey, who this week will be cited as one of ten outstanding civil servants, has often spoken about the continual changes in agriculture and how these changes concern and affect the ASCS. It's a "new era" of

agriculture that we are now in, as the Administrator puts it, and all ASCS people must be conscious of the changes and they should equip themselves to meet them and pattern our programs so as to bring to farmers the most benefits possible.

We all know that it is the Congress which has final authority over our programs. We should also be aware of the fact that Congress is becoming more representative of the increasing urban population.

It is therefore more susceptible to pressures exerted by the urban complex. I don't need to remind you that this could have serious implications on the future of farm legislation.

Congressmen, after all, are in Washington to meet the needs of, and represent their constituents. So one test we must always apply to our ASCS programs is how well they meet the "people's needs".

This is a challenge to all of us in ASCS, to insure that our programs do meet the "people's needs"...and that we administer them as such.

A challenge to committeemen will be in adjusting to the changes which are... and will...be taking place in our programs-----changes which reflect the "new era" of agriculture and which are necessitated by the "conservation crisis."

Let me describe four adjustments which we all must be cognizant of:

Under our ASCS commodity programs, such as feed grain and wheat, there will be more emphasis on conservation and protection of land that is cropped, and less emphasis will be placed on restricting production.

As I said, we are in a new era in farm policy. The once "burdensome surpluses" are gone, replaced by the present situation where there is a near-balance in stocks of grain. In fact, we are on the low edge of what might be considered a safe reserve.

Nevertheless, the U.S. agricultural plant still has the capacity to over-produce so the supply-demand balance must be kept on an even keel. This is difficult to do...and to do it we must walk a tight rope. We can be a year away from surplus or a year away from shortage.

Several million acres of cropland are coming back into production this year because of the need to rebuild our inventories. This means we must focus greater attention to protecting land that is in crops. And we will have to watch land use efficiency in relation to domestic and foreign needs.

Another challenge to our ASCS program will be in the area of providing better protection to hay and pasture land so as to insure an adequate supply of livestock and livestock products.

This is of deep concern here in the Northeast, particularly as it relates to dairying. Statistics illustrate the point dramatically. The Economic Research Service at USDA has calculated that by 1980 domestic consumption

10

24

of livestock products will be 40 percent above the 1959-61 level. This is about a five percent increase in consumption of livestock and livestock products each year.

To meet this increased need, we must insure that there is at least a corresponding increase in the improvement of our pasture and other roughage resources.

Prime reason for this expected rise in consumption of livestock and livestock products is the increase in consumer income. Because of this it seems obvious that we in ASCS must assign a higher priority to meet existing conservation problems and to improve our forage-producing lands.

A third challenge facing ASCS -- and this is particularly evident here in New England -- is how to cope with land use zoning and other controls of farmland.

We must keep in mind that some urban problems -- such as pollution and sedimentation -- often begin on the farm. We must do all we can to help farmers keep the problems of silt and pollution to a minimum.

I need not remind you that city people are becoming more water conscious. Water is life or death for them, as was illustrated during the recent drought years.

It is quite evident, I think, that our land use programs could become oriented to, and controlled by, city interests unless we succeed in helping farmers solve land use problems at their source.

There is one other major challenge to ASCS people that I would like to touch on today. And that is the increased demand for multiple uses of farmland.

This includes the use of land for wildlife and recreation as well as its use for protecting downstream water for cities and industry.

ASCS programs have contributed greatly to enhancing multiple uses of agricultural lands. Let me enumerate a few.

Production adjustment programs in recent years have diverted more than 50 million acres from crop production and into conservation uses. I realize, of course, that these programs are not nearly as applicable here in New England as in other areas of the country.

The Cropland Conversion Program, although still in pilot stage, helps farmers place cropland into other income-producing uses. More than 125 recreational projects, mostly hunting and fishing, have been started under this program. Others include hiking, horseback riding, and winter and water-based sports.

And then there's the Cropland Adjustment Program, now in its second year, that shifts acres out of crops and into such things as wildlife and recreation.

Let me make a special mention here of a CAR feature which we hope can be stepped up in the near future. That program is "Greenspan," through which local government units may obtain cropland and put it to public use. To date, 32 of these agreements have been signed throughout the country. To my knowledge, we don't have a Greenspan agreement yet in Vermont so we hope you people check again with municipalities and recreational authorities to see if there is potential for such projects in this state.

"Special ACP Projects" are another recent addition to our portfolio of conservation programs. These represent an "extra effort" where resources of several landowners are brought together to bring conservation benefits to an entire community. This is usually accompanied with a high level of cost-sharing.

A discussion of ASCS programs to promote multiple uses of farmland would not be complete without mention of the ACP farm pond effort. Here is a picture of one near Bath, Maine, where 40 families with over 100 children have a place to swim and picnic, as well as a place for winter sports.

It all came about through a special ACP project planned jointly between the farmer, county committee, community leaders and local USDA representatives.

By itself, of course, the pond doesn't make much of a dent in total needs. But remember, throughout the U. S. more than two million farm ponds have been built with ACP cost-sharing help. Their value for water retention, fire control, forest fire suppression, livestock water, irrigation, fish and wildlife conservation, landscape beautification and water-based recreation is immeasurable.

We have been talking about the challenges to the farmer committee system... can it adapt itself to meet the changing needs of agriculture, of farmers and of society itself. This brief summary of some of the accomplishments of ASCS programs shows clearly, I believe, that the farmer committee system has met the challenges of the past and I am confident it will meet those of the future.

I am convinced that the farm program would not be a success without the down-to-earth realism and farmer confidence that our program inspires.

Here in Vermont you have done a magnificent job in carrying out farm program goals. Witness of this is the fact that your State has one of the highest percentages of any in the nation of farmers participating in ACP practices with 70 percent of your cropland enrolled according to 1964 figures, the latest we have. Yet the challenge remains. You still have urgent needs in the field of conservation. And you have a great opportunity through the present farm legislation to make our programs fully beneficial to the farmers you serve and to the general public. Fulfilling these opportunities is the challenge to you.

Your fellow farmers elected you to the committeeman's job because they had confidence in your ability, judgment and leadership. We share in that confidence and we wish you every success in the days ahead.

Thank you for having me with you.

Talk by Forrest Orr, Director
Interagency Committee on Natural Resources
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont April 20, 1967

I must confess that for about two weeks or more the title of this talk has been staring me in the face. In the vernacular of the teen-ager, it has been "bugging" me. I am not sure just why, perhaps it is due to the fact that in my career I have heard many exhortations for cooperation, often delivered by speakers who had no real interest in the subject and were just talking because they had to talk on the matter.

I am not here to talk just for the sake of talking; cooperation, coordination in the Natural Resource field is a day-to-day job with me in my connection with the Interagency Committee. In that capacity I am aware of the growing pressures on our natural resources, the growing conflict over land use, and the crucial need for coordination among the many interests involved in this resource.

If I had to sum up, in one word, the biggest problem affecting Natural Resources, that one word is "people".

We are just simply running out of enough land to satisfy the needs of the hunter, the fisherman, the forester, the skier, the camper, the farmer, the hiker, the swimmer, the house builder, etc., etc.

With a population of less than 400,000 and a land area of over 5 million acres, it is obvious that critical pressures and conflicts on our resources are not due to Vermont's scattered population. We must look at what is happening outside our borders.

I am sure that most of you have heard time and time again the facts about our growing population and the growing concentration of this population in certain urban areas now referred to as the megapolis!

Census population figures indicate a population of from 226 - 279 million people in the U. S. by 1980. From 268 - 433 million by the year 2000.

Now there is a tendency to figure that 1980 is so far in the future, why worry about it. Well, I got to figuring that 17 years ago. I began working in the State Service, and it doesn't seem that long ago. If I survive another 17 years it will be 1984, so 1980 is not that far away, in fact it is only 13 years away.

But it is not population growth alone that is and will be affecting our Natural Resources. Of prime importance is the shift in population from rural to urban areas.

In 1790, the U. S. was a rural nation with only 5% of the population in cities. Today roughly 2/3 of the people live in cities. By 1980 eight out of every ten Americans will be urbanites.

Some 9 million people will be concentrated in the Boston zone, with some 31 million in the New York zone.

13

2

In addition to this numbers game, we are finding that people are becoming better educated and healthier. There is an ever-increasing period of leisure time as the average workweek decreases.

Annual vacations are becoming the rule for workers in nearly all occupations and the average vacation length is growing.

We are becoming a more mobile people what with better roads, better cars and other modes of transportation.

Incomes are also increasing.

Put them all together and what do they mean to our Natural Resources?

We must consider one other factor - our problem is Vermont's geography.

To the North is an ever-growing megapolis known as the Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto Complex.

To the East and South, lies an ever coalescing megapolis extending from Portland, Maine to Virginia.

Within these areas will be a vast mass of people with ever-increasing incomes, and ever-increasing amounts of leisure time and living by choice and necessity in an orderly, regulated society. Modern, urban society exacts a toll for the benefits it offers; the price is conformity, togetherness and no small amount of monotony.

In this well-ordered society, recreation in general and outdoor recreation in particular, offers the urbanite occasional freedom - freedom from the boredom of conformity, freedom from masses of people, freedom from noise and the hustle and bustle of megapolistic life.

And here lies Vermont, in between population concentrations, becoming more and more accessible, still relatively unspoiled if you ignore the junk yards and the growing garish strip development that now characterizes our own modest urban sprawl.

We are the Beckoning Country.

Yet we already see evidence of pressure on our natural resources -

Spiralling, inflated land prices, often create a local tax situation that is discouraging to the farmer and timber grower. We see sprawling housing developments, often on prime agricultural land. We see manmade intrusions defacing our mountains, and we are experiencing more and more conflicts over land use.

On one hand, we have a sincere group of interested people who want to see restrictions placed on development above 2500 ft. elevation; on the other hand, we see pressure being applied to state agencies to develop more ski areas on other mountains.

And the recreation pressures on our resources will continue to build, for it has been demonstrated that when people are free to select how they will spend their leisure time and leisure money, many will choose outdoor recreation.

We must not make the mistake of associating Outdoor Recreation solely in terms of activity sports -- swimming, skiing, camping -- it is these things and many more, it is all things to all people.

It is swimming in Lake Champlain.

It is boating on Memphremagog.

It is hiking the Long Trail.

Skimming the slopes of Mansfield.

But it is also driving on scenic roads, revelling in the profuse and varied fall foliage.

It is standing on one's porch and viewing Camel's Hump, a mountain set aside in its natural condition to remain free of the ski trail slash, the protruding TV antenna, free of the utility swath and free from the obvious intrusions of man.

We have ample evidence that Vermont's environment, which we Vermonters tend to take for granted, is proving an ever-increasing attraction to those less fortunate people outside our borders.

This attraction is not without economic benefits to our limited economy; the problem and the challenge is to maintain the economic progress of our State without destroying our environment.

How do we solve the problems of junk yards? You can't outlaw them for they are a necessary part of our economy. The car we bought today must eventually wear out. What to do with the carcass.

We are concerned with water quality, the cleanliness of our rivers and streams. Yet there are practical limitations to water quality. With our limited economy we need continued industrial development. Yet industry needs energy. What do we do in considering a possible atomic generating plant that will possibly increase the water temperature by 20°? Shopping centers and motels are necessary, but must we continually sacrifice prime agricultural land? How do we maintain open land, this portion of our environment that contributes to making our State so attractive?

How do we resolve the growing pressures from those who want to see our highlands preserved and those who want additional development?

These are but some of the problems, a scratching of the surface.

The solution to our resource problems is beyond the capabilities of any one agency, group or even one government body.

Through cooperative effort, through working together, by pooling the resources of State agencies, Federal agencies, private groups and individuals, we can meet the challenge to our Natural Resources and develop them the way we want them developed.

The alternative of self-interest, distrust, suspicion -- can only result in chaos.

THE EXTENSION SERVICE • UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Talk by William W. Stone
Supervisor and Program Leader
Agriculture and Resource Development
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

Scope of Extension Work

The Extension Service has responsibility in developing and carrying out educational efforts with a broad base clientele in Vermont. Essentially, it is the application of research results on farms and in the homes of the state. Another area of Extension work is the cooperative relationship with USDA. This brings us to a responsibility in an informational sense, as well as educational.

Specifically, in working with ASCS, I am sure that the objectives are pretty much the same.

Extension operates within a broad scope and detailing the specifics would take too much time at this meeting. A way of presenting this in an outline form follows:

1. Agricultural production, management and natural resource development.
2. Marketing and utilization of farm products.
3. Home economics.
4. Youth development.
5. Resource development and public affairs.

We call these project areas and, consequently, report our activities and efforts within these five broad areas.

I will not try to evaluate the relative importance of each, for all touch on the economic, social, and cultural life of Vermonters.

Recent Changes in Extension

This past year over 35,000 Vermont families were reached, which required special types of educational work. For example, in our work with low-income families we are using an Urban Center for adult and youth work in the city of Burlington, VISTA volunteers in two sections of the state, and work-study students as semiprofessionals.

We note that there are several cooperative-type ventures with other agencies. Among these is a Coronary Heart Disease Prevention Program with the Department of Health and an Institutional Management Program as part of the cooperation with the Higher Education Act.

During the last few years there has been an Income Producing Recreation on Private Lands project on which Jack Lindsay and Mal Bevins have been working. The purpose of this is, of course, to show the economics and physical structures and land use as income producing for Vermonters.

16

2

Within the community and resource development aspect, we have noted a lot of effort has gone into regional planning and development. Here we find cooperation with the Central Planning Office, the Technical Action Panels (of which ASCS is a member), and the Development Department. Leadership training comes into the picture here and the natural resource technical team idea and action. It really boils down to fuller use of federal and state programs in this whole field of resource development.

With youth, our camping facilities have been opened to all youth, and we note that the training for young agricultural leaders was successful for the second time. This was conducted in cooperation with the Vermont Cooperative Council and others.

In the Extension Homemakers' Council and National Safety Council we have seen a real driver training for individuals, as well as developing regional health conferences.

Within commercial dairying, we note that the decision-making aspect of management is becoming more and more important. The tools of management, such as use of soil testing, ELFAC, DHIA, Plan Herd Health, and others are more important. In-depth schools in management decision making, as well as work with milk marketing cooperatives and in the whole field of milk marketing orders. A Master Milker Program, which is actually a contest, is designed to assist change in attitudes and action from milking being a chore to being part of the business operation of a dairy farm.

As a result, we have seen some real changes in methods of operation. For example, more direct mail and mass media is being used, while at the same time the demand on Extension workers' time for individual counseling has increased. This changes the image of Extension in the eyes of people we work with and, as methods change, to keep up with the times and meet problems of people. Perhaps we all change.

Growing Problems in Vermont

Others on the conference program today will talk about some of Vermont's problems, but I should point out that changing land use, impact of our growing suburbia, the economics of agricultural enterprises, and the movement of people are only part of a whole list of problems facing Vermonters.

Many of these new problems, such as those dealing with conservation, water, open space, natural beauty, wildlife, agricultural enterprises need new patterns of organizations and agencies.

The reason for this is, of course, that the concerns of individuals are more likely to be solved in group action.

Consequently, there are a host of new agency programs at both the state and federal level which could be considered as tools of communities (people working together). The translation of the use of these tools into action at the local level becomes one of the big problems today. Within ASCS I am sure that the changing practice use, as well as the changing practices themselves, cause re-evaluation from time to time.

Responsibilities with ASCS

County extension agents are ex-officio members of county committees and Director Davison is likewise with the state committee.

Ex-officio has a number of meanings but in our close working relationships, this means a complete understanding of both agencies' programs and objectives, as well as the operating methods. Obviously, from time to time there is a real need to sit down at the county level and talk over policies, relationships, and to develop action programs.

Working Cooperatively

Many of the items I will mention regarding working together I am sure you are already doing. Perhaps, though, I can pinpoint some things that you may want to pursue further from the standpoint of a county committeeman.

All the following specifics relative to working together are important. The list does not attempt to place one item as being more important than the other.

1. County Committee Meetings - Here the agent concerned should be notified well in advance with some idea of the items to be covered at the meeting. While the county agent should not be concerned with routine matters, certainly when policy is discussed (or plans for various activities), time should be set aside for these matters.
2. Public Relations - Both agencies have worked over the years in a basic public relation plan. This means use of radio, news, direct mail, and other methods. A periodic review of the working agreement here and, perhaps, an evaluation of the efforts should be built into the system.
3. Citizen Understanding of Practices - It would seem that the policy of the county committee relative to individual practices needs thorough understanding on the part of landowners. Many instances come up where the landowner needs to be motivated to look into the possibilities. While we have a large percentage of our land signed up under the ACP program, I am sure that there are blanks in areas of the State where effort needs to be put forth.
4. General - I believe time is needed in developing any series of meetings, schools, community committeeman training, and other activities in which both agencies may be involved. In our busy day-by-day schedules we sometimes forget that alternative plans may be necessary in case of weather, economic influences, other activities, or other.
5. New Programs - The total responsibilities of ASCS with the several programs that are implemented from time to time should be related to the communities. By this I mean that the legal authorities, such as selectmen, school officials, and others who either have land ownership or responsibilities with public programs.

Final Thoughts

In this whole field of inter-agency relations I am sure that communication comes up from time to time. For example, having offices in the same building is helpful, but we need to talk together periodically. Relationships are jelling within the USDA Technical Action Panel idea as this group moves ahead into new areas. The recognition of our mutual concern with natural resource conservation is one that will see more effort in this field of relations.

18

We are concerned with good land use, income production from well managed land, and the whole area of maintaining and continuing a viable agricultural business.

Our long association since the mid-thirties still requires mutual relationships and mutual responsibilities. Face-to-face discussions scheduled on a regular basis and followed up with action on the part of both agencies seems to be the way that this relationship may be continued in the fine fashion it is today.

19
+
WORKING WITH OTHERS

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE ACTIVITIES IN VERMONT
Talk by David N. Grimwood, State Conservationist, SCS
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

It is a real pleasure for me to meet with you for the first time in my new role of State Conservationist.

I pledge that I will do my best to help continue the very fine relationship that has existed between our agencies in the past.

In the next few minutes I will review with you the highlights of Soil Conservation Service activities in Vermont.

SOIL SURVEYS

In 1966, 93,509 acres of new and revised soil surveys were completed. To date, 52.8% of the State has been surveyed. Two counties, Grand Isle and Addison have been completely surveyed. The survey report for Grand Isle has been published. The report for Addison County is being prepared for publication.

The use of basic soils information by planning commissions, land developers, communities, engineering consultants, highway departments, as well as landowners, is increasing. The City of Burlington is making use of a special soil survey report prepared through arrangements made with their planning consultant.

We are now preparing special interpretive soils reports for Chittenden and Orange Counties. These special reports will be used in working with town planning commissions and others. We expect to complete field surveys in Chittenden County by the end of the 1967 field season and in Orange County by the end of the 1968 field season.

Soil survey information is very valuable to all groups and individuals in making land use decisions. We are unable to fill all requests for this information at our present rate of mapping.

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT

Jewell Brook Watershed

Construction of the South Hill diversion channel is well underway. This should be completed during 1967. A contract has been let for the construction of Floodwater Retarding Structure #1. Construction will start soon and will be completed during 1968. Designs for Sites #2 and #3 are well underway. Surveys and geologic investigations of Site #5 will be made this spring.

The bill passed by the 1966 Vermont Legislature giving the Water Resources Board the power of eminent domain will enable the sponsors to complete this project as planned.

Browns River Watershed

The high cost of construction, together with a somewhat limited amount of benefits to the agricultural land in the floodplain, has caused us to make a re-evaluation of this project. Some of the original proposals to include seven floodwater retarding structures will not be feasible under present criteria used in evaluating projects. We are developing alternative proposals for discussion with local sponsors and State agencies in the coming weeks and hope to have a plan firmed up in the near future.

Upper Castleton River Watershed

Field surveys have been completed. We are ready to start evaluating sites and alternative flood control proposals.

Wells River Watershed

Field surveys are about half completed. We expect to finish this part of the job during the 1967 field season.

The proposed Federal legislation to include storage of water for stream-flow augmentation as a purpose of P.L. 566 projects would have special significance in Vermont. State officials have advocated this for several years. Other provisions of proposed Federal legislation would permit (1) use of other non-P.L. 566 Federal funds for land rights, and (2) long range contracts for land treatment in P.L. 566 projects.

RIVER BASIN STUDIES

Connecticut River (Type II)

The Soil Conservation Service River Basin Party, headquartered at Durham, New Hampshire, will concentrate on the Vermont portion of the basin during 1967.

North Atlantic (Type I)

We have designated two of our staff people to work on this study. They are working closely with the Soil Conservation Service North Atlantic River Basin Planning Party, which is headquartered at Somerset, New Jersey. Our aim is to complete all field work by the end of the 1967 field season.

Areas and communities that have active planning groups are being given priority when making these studies. Every attempt will be made to keep RC&D Project sponsors, town and regional planning commissions, and soil and water conservation district supervisors fully informed of our findings.

STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL

Some of the early conservation work in Vermont was aimed at erosion control along our creek and river banks. The Winooski River Project, carried out in the 1930's, was the first of its kind in the nation. Streambank erosion control was a prime objective of the organizers of the first soil conservation districts in Vermont. Streambank erosion is still taking place on about a third of the lineal length of all streambanks in the State. The costs involved and the need to install control measures that involve multiple land ownerships make it difficult and often impossible for individual landowners to install the needed measures. Sediment from streambanks is a prime pollutant of our lakes and water supplies.

Vermont has 2,084 miles of rivers and streams with a drainage area greater than ten square miles. This involves 4,168 miles of streambanks. About 30% or 1,250 miles of these banks are contributing sediment to stream flow. Most of these banks are accessible and could be controlled with stabilization measures.

Proposed Federal legislation to provide assistance to State and local sponsors for streambank erosion control would be of great significance to Vermont.

During 1966, plans were laid to work with representatives of the Agricultural Research Service, the University of Vermont, and Johns Hopkins University in making a study of the results of the Winooski River Project. It is expected that State agencies may be involved. The purpose of the study is to determine the effectiveness, after 30 years, of the various measures used. It is expected that the results of this study will be published. The information will be useful in helping plan similar measures in the future.

WHITE RIVER RESOURCE CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Eight project measures have been completed, 13 are being installed, and 30 are being planned.

Designs have been completed for the proposed 80-acre Halls Brook Development. The developers are making arrangements for financing this project measure. We hope that construction can get underway in 1968.

Surveys were made for the proposed Ayers Brook project measure. Engineering data shows that a lake ranging in size between 60 acres and 600+ acres could be installed. We are working closely with agencies of the State of Vermont and with the local people in determining the feasibility of the project. Our engineers have made cost estimates for alternate size lakes. The job of determining the size of the lake, methods of financing, etc. is ahead of us. There is considerable interest among local people. State agency people are taking a look to see how this measure would fit into the State Recreation Plan, its relation to Gaysville Dam and other considerations that would influence the State's interest.

22

4

We are making satisfactory progress in accelerating conservation planning and application assistance and soil surveys. Interest in the use of land for recreation continues to grow. Resource planning with community groups is just getting started. Requests have been received from the Towns of Bradford and Newbury. We expect our work with these groups to help bring about a greater involvement of the local people.

The proposed Federal legislation to authorize cost sharing for the purpose of fish and wildlife and recreation developments in RC&D projects would contribute greatly toward reaching project objectives. Senator Aiken is a sponsor of this legislation.

Jack Davis has replaced Eugene Hanchett as Project Coordinator, William Steele has been named Work Unit Conservationist for the Randolph Work Unit. The Vermont Forest Service has placed two men at Randolph to work with woodland owners and woods products users. The Extension Service has two resource development specialists working in the area part time. The University of Vermont and other State and Federal agencies are most helpful.

Jack Davis will discuss this subject in more detail tomorrow. He will discuss with you some ideas he has for the use of ACP in the project.

PLANNING COMMISSIONS

The Service is providing soils information, interpretive maps and other basic resource data to communities and counties in the State. This information is provided to natural resource sub-committees of planning commissions and is used in the development of comprehensive land use plans. Service employees serve as members of technical teams of professional foresters, economists, conservationists, and recreation specialists that supply much of the basic data for decision making by the natural resource sub-committees. Soil and Water Conservation District Boards approve applications and set priority for this assistance. The South Burlington and Franklin County Planning Commissions are pioneers in the use of these technical teams.

Requests are coming in from Grand Isle, Lamoille County and others. Since County Technical Action Panels will be the core of the Natural Resources Technical Teams in the future, ASCS personnel will want to be included as members of these Teams. I hope they will help keep the Teams alert to opportunities to use ACP and other ASCS programs to further group and community type projects.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

There is an ever increasing demand by the public for additional recreation areas. Vermont's strategic location between the metropolitan areas of the Eastern Seaboard and Montreal, Canada is an important factor. The Service is presently cooperating with districts and other agencies in inventories of existing recreation and in making appraisals of potentials for recreation developments. ASCS employees have and, I hope, will continue to contribute to these efforts. Also, I think there may be additional opportunities to use ACP and CAP to develop recreational enterprises.

CONSERVATION NEEDS INVENTORY

Leadership in the revision of the Conservation Needs Inventory of 1958-59 has been assigned to the Service. The revision, to be completed in 1967, will provide an up-to-date summary of each county's conservation needs. It is planned to publish an up-to-date summary on a statewide basis as well as on a county basis. This information will be available to all interested agencies and groups for use in future soil and water conservation programs. ASCS people have been major participants on both State and County CNI Committees.

LAND TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Helping landowners to plan and apply conservation practices continues to be the major activity of the Soil Conservation Service in Vermont. It is true that in some areas, non-farm landowners are beginning to outnumber farm land owners as Soil and Water Conservation District cooperators. However, in the good farming areas, our work in drainage, pond construction, and similar practices used by farmers continues at about the same level as in the past.

Last year, assistance by SCS included:

- 4,071 Landowners received technical assistance
- 567 Landowners became District cooperators
- 416 Farmers developed or revised conservation plans
- 35 Non-farmers developed or revised conservation plans
- 414 Consultive services were provided to individuals, groups, state agencies, planning commissions and other agencies and organizations on the use of soils, water, vegetative and engineering practices
- 13 Landowners and operators established their first commercial recreation enterprise

Some conservation practices on land in 1966:

- 18,330 feet Diversion Terraces
- 194 no. Farm ponds
- 192 no. Fish pond stocking
- 288 acres Land smoothing
- 147,267 feet Mains and laterals
- 26,845 feet Drainage field ditch
- 88,155 feet Tile drains
- 32 no. Spring developments

Of course, ACP cost-sharing contributed to the establishment of the above practices. Likewise, SCS technicians helped plan many of the vegetative practices, which also received ACP cost-sharing, but are not reflected here.

24

8

ASCS-SCS RELATIONS

There is a great need for us to work closely in the future. First, we will need to be sure that we develop ACPrograms that will accomplish the greatest amount of conservation that would not otherwise get done. Second, we need to carry out ACPrograms as efficiently as we know how - efficient screening and handling of referrals on your part and efficient servicing and handling of referrals on our part.

We have cooperated and will continue to do so on such activities as Defense Boards, TAP, etc.

It has been a pleasure for me to meet with you.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Talk by Keith L. Wortman, District Supervisor
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

This presentation will be broken down into four major categories:

- I Farmers home Administration achievements in 1966 and to date in 1967
- II Units Organizational Set-up
- III Loan types and changes
- IV What's in the Future for FHA

I Refer to tabulations at end of talk.

II FHA Organizational Set-up

New England headquarters is at Orono, Maine. The Orono staff consists of a 3-man Real Estate division, 2-man Operating Loan division, 2-man Association division and a one-man RCDS division.

There are 4 districts, two in Maine, one in Montpelier, Vermont, and one in Concord, N.H.

Total working force in Vermont is 24 people with 7 offices located in Montpelier, Middlebury, Rutland, Springfield, Newport, St. Johnsbury and St. Albans.

III Loaning Procedures and Policies

A. Farm Ownership

This is a long-term advance - basically it's set up to assist eligible applicants to become owner-operators of family-type farms and to assist in making efficient use of farmer's land, labor and other resources.

Eligibility requirements:

1. Farm background and experience
2. Citizen of U.S.
3. Legal capacity.
4. Possess character, ability and industry
5. Cannot get credit elsewhere

Loan purposes:

1. Purchase farms
2. Construct or improve buildings
3. Install or repair water systems
4. Refinance debts

Terms: 5% - up to 40 years to repay
\$60,000 maximum advance

26
Security requirements:

Mortgage of entire farm unit if advance is over \$2500 -
otherwise chattels or real estate

B. Operating Loans

This is a short-term advance to enable farmers to carry on a
successful system of farming. Basically this advance is set up
to take care of every-day operational needs.

Eligibility requirements:

About the same as for farm ownership.

Loan purposes:

1. Purchase livestock, equipment and poultry
2. Purchase feed, seed, fertilizer, labor, etc.
3. Refinance chattel debts
4. Real estate improvements

Terms: 5% - up to 7 years to repay

In some cases extended to 10 years - \$35,000 maximum advance

Security requirements:

Mortgage of chattels, including crops

C. Rural Housing

This is a long-term advance to assist farmers and rural residents
to obtain decent, safe and sanitary housing and related buildings

Eligibility requirements:

1. Reside in a rural area
2. Be without sufficient resources (both funds & housing)
3. Possess character and have repayment ability
4. Possess legal capacity

Loan purposes:

1. Construct, improve or relocate a dwelling or farm building
2. Purchase necessary housing
3. Install or repair water system
4. Refinance debts

Terms: 5% - up to 33 years to repay

\$60,000 maximum advance

Security requirements:

Mortgage on buildings, lot and farms

D. Emergency Loans

This is a short-term farm advance available to designated areas, set up due to a natural disaster.

Eligibility requirements:

Basically same as operating loans

Loan purposes:

1. Purchase feed, seed and fertilizer
 2. Replace cattle and machinery
 3. Payment of old bills
 4. Family subsistence needs
- Terms: 3% - up to 7 years to repay
No upward limits on advance

Security requirements

Best mortgage obtainable on chattels

E. Economic Opportunity Loans

This advance is to improve the capacity of an applicant to increase his standard of living and up his income.

Eligibility requirements:

1. Be the head of a low income family
2. Possess the character, ability and industry necessary to carry out the proposed operation

Loan purposes:

1. Purchase farm cattle, equipment and finance other operating type expenses
 2. Purchase real estate
 3. Refinance debts
 4. Repairs, construct buildings
 5. Purchase necessary equipment and chattels to establish an enterprise
- Terms: 4-1/8% - up to 15 years to repay
\$3500 maximum advance
Security requirements - Promissory note only

IV What's in the Future for FHA

Although the stress is still on farm business (FO-OL) it appears we're moving more heavily into our Rural Housing program. I see no major procedure changes coming up other than an expansion to our association loaning.

Barring any shortage of funds it appears the 1967-68 loaning will be within the 8 or 9 million dollar bracket which is somewhat more than last year.

Continued stress will be on helping people help themselves with the use of Government funds and supervisory counseling.

TOTAL ADVANCES
FISCAL YEAR 1966
VERMONT
July 1, 1966

Office	FO		OL		RH		EM		EC		TOTAL	
	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances
1. Middlebury	22	415,400	35	358750	33	306850	62	150500	3	6000	155	1,237,500
2. Montpelier	31	545,700	67	516930	39	359810	84	129130	8	9350	229	1,560,920
3. Newport	46	648,670	110	808480	30	179600			7	14390	193	1,651,140
4. Rutland	20	349,920	36	268530	24	188780	43	60540	4	7550	127	875,320
5. St. Albans	33	591,190	56	486120	20	142850	6	3250	2	4100	117	1,227,510
6. Springfield	4	109,100	28	224380	19	189170	31	51740			82	574,390
TOTAL	156	2,659,980	332	2,663190	165	1,367060	226	395160	24	41390	903	7,126,780

PREVIOUS LOAN ACTIVITY IN VERMONT

1956	574,000	1960	492,000	1964	860,180
1957	457,000	1961	568,000	1965	2,482,150
1958	504,000	1962	886,000	1966	7,125,000
1959	546,000	1963	804,570		

TOTAL ADVANCES

JULY 1, 1966 - APRIL 1, 1967
VERMONT

Office	FO		OL		RH		EM		EO		TOTAL	
	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances	No.	Advances
1. Middlebury	12	312,620	48	281,950	34	352,200	4	6,750	2	1,960	100	955,480
2. Montpelier	27	478,220	72	439,550	52	510,850	13	13,000	3	6,900	167	1,448,520
3. Newport	24	343,610	65	342,160	69	544,050			5	9,130	163	1,238,950
4. Rutland	5	166,000	32	151,400	39	370,630	5	4,400			81	692,430
5. St. Albans	56	1,274,800	92	967,230	44	434,550			10	31,300	202	2,707,880
6. Springfield	2	54,200	20	123,190	42	467,300	3	4,700			67	649,390
TOTAL	126	2,629,450	329	2,505,480	280	2,679,580	25	28,850	20	49,290	780	7,692,650

31
WORKING WITH OTHERS

STATE FOREST SERVICE

Summary of talk by Robert Farrington, Assistant Director of Forests
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

The work of the Vermont Forest Service was previously confined strictly to the marking of trees and to assisting with the production and marketing of wood products. Now the work of the Forest Service includes as one of the important items, the working with all other State and Federal agencies within the State.

There are $4\frac{1}{4}$ million acres of woodland in Vermont which represent 72% of the land area of the State. Since 1956, an additional quarter million acres of woodland has been added due to the abandonment of farming in some areas.

The income from forests in Vermont amounts to \$150 million a year which is about the same as the income from recreation and tourism in the State.

The private landowner realizes about two-fifths of the value of his land while the other three-fifths of the value is enjoyed by others. Present State tax laws are creating a burden on private landowners. Let me cite the case of a private landowner who owned 32 acres which was previously taxed at about \$1.20 an acre. With the new tax appraisals, the tax on each acre of this land has increased to \$4.50. This is a hazard to private ownership and certainly detrimental to the practice of good forestry on private lands.

The value of standing timberland cut in the State amounts to about \$5 million a year, and these products after processing are worth about \$145 million. This activity provides work for many hundreds of workers within the State.

Every acre of Vermont woodland should have some improvement work done. In many cases, it is not practical due to the location and type of land upon which the trees are growing.

I realize that Vermont county foresters have a backlog of work to approve. The State Forest Service is ready to cooperate in expediting the work in any county where it is felt that progress is not satisfactory at the present time.

The cooperation between ASCS and the Vermont Forest Service is very good and we look forward to continuing this good relationship in the future.

STATE FISH AND GAME SERVICE

Summary of Talk by Edward Kehoe, Commissioner
at State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

The posting of private lands is creating many problems. The Department of Fish and Game is establishing a five-year program which stresses the importance of private land, and especially the private land owned by farmers. The Fish and Game Service and other Vermont agencies would not need to acquire any land if the Vermont farmer could be kept in business. However, since there is the continuing trend for small farmers located in the hill areas to go out of business, this five-year program will include the purchase of abandoned farms to be kept open for sportsmen and for other public use. This program will include the mowing and improvement of these lands for game management.

I hope in the future to develop closer contact between the Department of Fish and Game and farmers, and expect that after July 1 of this year we will be able to enlarge our staff.

At present the Fish and Game Service owns over 70,000 acres of land and is buying more. It seems probable that a future Vermont legislature will make it possible for towns to tax State lands at an increased rate from the rate now in effect.

I would just like to mention that the release program for pheasants has worked out well, and we are making plans for future stocking of these birds.

There has been some new legislation which I would like to discuss briefly. A new law which makes it illegal to hunt or shoot within 500 feet of any building has been passed. Another new law prohibits sportsmen or others from driving into driveways and fields on private lands. These laws should help to improve relations between landowners and hunters.

In 1966, ten thousand more out-of-State hunting licenses were issued in Vermont than in the previous year. In all, there are 150 to 160 thousand hunters licensed in Vermont. A review of the recent doe season is now in progress, and it appears that additional doe seasons in selected areas will be permitted in the future.

THE VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Talk by Robert Branon, Commissioner
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

The Vermont Department of Agriculture was established in 1908 to administer the laws pertaining to agriculture and to promote the agricultural interests of the state. Innumerable changes have been made through legislative and executive action during the past 59 years. However, the general objectives of the Department are still regulatory and promotional. The Department consists of six functional divisions or units, in addition to the Commissioner's administrative division. These divisions are each staffed under directors to perform specific responsibilities.

The Commissioner's office is responsible for the administration of the divisions and, in addition, serves as Chairman of the Milk Control Board, the Vermont Dairy Industry Council and is a member of various other councils and committees.

The Livestock Division is responsible for carrying out livestock import regulations to prevent diseased or infected animals from entering the state. Control and eradication of contagious or infectious animal diseases, as well as the licensing and bonding of livestock and poultry dealers is supervised by this division. The meat inspection program, which provides for ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection of all livestock slaughtered for human consumption is being implemented by this division. This division also maintains a brucellosis and pullorum testing laboratory.

The Dairy Division is responsible for the enforcement of laws and regulations pertaining to dairy products. Dairy Sanitarians work with producers, handlers, processors and distributors throughout the state. Milk and other dairy products are analyzed in the dairy laboratory. Dairy farmers are assisted in meeting the standards adopted by market areas where Vermont milk is sold. Types of licenses issued include: sales of oleomargarine, frozen dairy products; milk dealers and milk retailers. Statistical information on the purchase and distribution of milk is compiled. Inspection and grading of dairy products is also performed. Administrative work is performed by the Dairy Division for the Vermont Milk Control Board, the Dairy Industry Council and the Dairy Council.

The Plant Pest Control Division maintains programs for controlling insects, pests and diseases which damage plant or forest products. Principal programs include Dutch Elm Disease, nursery inspections, registering of pesticides, seed potato certification, crop seed certification, gypsy moth quarantine and editing the Department publication - Agriview. This division works with other state and federal agencies to assist farmers and other property owners in the control of insect pests and plant diseases, such as the tent caterpillar, army worm, alfalfa weevil and maple die back.

Markets Division is responsible for enforcement of laws and regulations pertaining to the grading and labelling of farm products. Major areas include maple syrup and other maple products, apples, potatoes, eggs and other poultry products. Producers, handlers and distributors receive assistance in meeting problems associated with quality and consumer acceptance. Market news reporting is conducted on a weekly basis. An exchange list is published in conjunction with the Agriview newsletter at no cost to farmers.

The Division of Standards, periodically, calibrates and seals commercially used scales, meters and other weighing or measuring devices. Major areas of work include inspection and sealing scales, gas and oil pumps, petroleum meters, weights, calibration of bulk milk tanks and checking net weight of prepackaged materials.

These five divisions comprise the organization of the Department as it has operated for the past several years. The responsibilities of these five divisions has been primarily regulatory in the area of consumer protection. During the past year an Agricultural Development division has been established. It is projected that this division can develop promotional and quality programs to expand market outlets for Vermont agricultural products.

This division will work with individuals as well as commodity groups, in an effort to provide the best possible market for all Vermont agricultural products.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that, in working together, we should keep in mind the following points:

1. The importance of agriculture to the economy of Vermont.
2. Vermont farms going out of production create a land use problem.
3. Comprehensive planning should be based on land use needs for agriculture with respect to land classification for agricultural purposes.

35

FARMING IN VENEZUELA

Summary of Slide Talk by B. Frank Myott
Former State ASC Committeeman
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 20, 1967

As many of you may know, I recently had the opportunity to go to Venezuela under the auspices of Farmers and World Affairs. Our group remained in that country for approximately six weeks, and I think the best way to tell you about my experiences is to show you some slides depicting the life and times of Venezuela as it is today.

One of the things that stands out in my memory is that the people in that country seem to be either extremely wealthy or extremely poor. There seems to be no middle, average class. Some of the farms have very modern up-to-date equipment and facilities and are being farmed to a high degree of efficiency. Next to such a farm, it is common to see very primitive methods in agriculture.

In my opinion, there is a big potential for growth and great opportunity, both in the field of agriculture and industry. I can see many opportunities for young Americans settling in Venezuela.

Talk by Everett H. F. Felber, Director
Farmer Programs Division, ASCS
at State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

Certainly, I need not remind anyone in this audience that land is our basic resource and is, in fact, the common denominator of everything material. No matter how high man raises himself on the stilts of modern living, he must be always aware that his props have their bottoms poked into the earth. Man can forget this only at his own peril.

Likewise, man must always be concerned about the cover on the land. For without cover, no matter what it may be, land is virtually worthless and so, too, is man.

We all know that down through the years man has frequently treated cover and land with abuse and greed. Man was always the loser when he did this. We know that dust storms, floods, erosion, denuded forests and abandoned farms were the results of these abuses.

Today, I would like to discuss with you briefly the present role and status of our conservation and land use programs and speculate with you a bit about their future.

Let's start with ACP which is my favorite conservation program -- as I know it is yours. It is not only our oldest program, but the program which is the basis for the entire farmer committee system -- of which you and I are so proud.

Certainly, it can be expected that ACP, as well as other farm programs, will be reviewed closely in the light of the current supply and demand situation and the need for increased production to meet the world food and fiber requirements in the future.

Conservation is not a static thing and ACP cannot, and has not been, a static program. Our present ACP includes policies and procedures which have been developed over a substantial period of time. Recommendations from the field have always been a major factor in program development.

If it has not already been done, you are about to embark on another round of program development. I suggest that you take this opportunity seriously -- and that you make frank recommendations for changes to be made in not only your county, but the State, and National Programs for 1968.

Certainly, some of the restrictions and requirements in our present program need to be removed or modified. They all need to be reviewed.

Many of these restrictions were incorporated into the program in the recent years when we were faced with surpluses of many commodities.

To my mind the modification of these requirements would not represent a basic change in the program but would simply make a more logical application of the existing general program principles which have been so successfully effected over the years.

39 2

I will not promise that everything you recommend will be adopted -- but I can assure you that it will be thoroughly and honestly considered.

ACP has been effective both from the standpoint of conservation accomplishments and public interest. It is a program which can be defended from the standpoint of the use of public funds. Certainly, the Congress of the United States -- with some very effective prodding on your part -- agrees with this, because it has had many clear opportunities in the last 10 to 15 years to reduce the size of the appropriation from \$250 million to \$100 or \$125 million dollars -- but did not do so.

I believe that it has been clearly demonstrated that ACP can be adapted to meet changing conditions. During World War II, and in the years immediately following the war, the program was used to encourage shifts in production needed to supply the commodities in demand at the time. In recent years, the program has been used to encourage shifts to land uses which would help alleviate the surpluses of various commodities.

There may be some who believe that the current and prospective demand for agricultural commodities is such that there is no need for a program such as ACP and that, as a matter of fact, ACP will actually prevent farmers from accomplishing the effort to meet world needs. I doubt that very many of you subscribe to such a belief.

History is full of situations in which once prosperous and powerful nations lost their prosperity and power because they failed to conserve their soil and water resources. I believe, that we have learned from this that we can never go through an all-out production effort and disregard the need for conservation without having fatal consequences result.

The demands for food and fiber in the 1970's, the 1980's and the year 2000 will be much greater than they are now. I believe that it is true that improved technology will largely serve to fill these demands if, our soil and water resources are used wisely now and in the years immediately ahead -- in order to provide a good base for the application of these new and improved production methods.

From a practical viewpoint, an over-all program to increase production of agricultural commodities will increase the need for conservation programs. The emphasis of these programs may very well change somewhat, but the basic program need not be changed.

A real fine example of how ACP can adapt itself to changing times, and to the needs of the day, is well shown by the current provisions relating to special projects.

Special projects utilize regular ACP provisions but in such a way that we are able to assist in completing conservation accomplishments that otherwise would not be completed.

Under special projects community interest is developed because all agencies and other interested groups combine their effort toward a single accomplishment.

Funds can be concentrated to provide a substantial and direct impact so as to enable individuals to attack and overcome conservation problems which would be overwhelming to the individuals if they had to go after them on an individual, piecemeal basis.

One of the principal benefits of the special projects approach is that it gets a lot more people interested in what ACP can do and is doing. Therefore, we in ASCS, and particularly you folks in the counties, must take the lead in arousing and obtaining this public interest.

Obviously, to do this, the project must have a somewhat broader appeal than the regular ACP practices as carried out on individual farms, -- or the special project must have discernable incidental benefits to nonfarm people and areas.

You may not find situations in every county which will lend themselves to the development of good special practices and, believe me, we would rather have no special projects than a bunch of poor special projects. However, I am convinced that a little serious thought and effort on your part will turn up more opportunities along this line than might at first be expected.

Vermont has had only one special ACP project. I understand it was successful. A number of states have many special projects most of which produced good results. I would suggest that you might develop more special projects which will make for a more effective and better recognized ACP.

Let me make a minor diversion for a moment to briefly talk about the conservation needs inventory. ASCS is participating with eight other agencies in updating the needs inventory which was made in 1958-60. We have a two-fold interest in this inventory: First: The conservation needs inventory provides the only comprehensive measure of the size of the conservation job, both on a total, and on an annual basis. It gives us definite measures of the conservation jobs in the Nation, and in the States, and counties. These are tangible, understandable measures that can be used to plan programs, to measure accomplishments, and to tell the Congress, and the public what is needed. Second: The law provides that ACP funds are to be allocated on the basis of conservation needs. Thus, while the inventory is useful to other agencies, it is indispensable to ASCS. It is a tool other agencies like to have. It is one ASCS must have.

Of necessity, basic data for such an inventory are obtained on a sample basis and much of the data are processed on automatic equipment. Samples have their limitations. They range from very good to very bad, and only informed, knowledgeable persons like yourselves can tell which is which. Machines can't make these kinds of distinctions.

Conservation needs inventory committees have the responsibility for reviewing these data and making certain that they reflect the actual conditions in their counties and states.

ASCS is on every State and county group dealing with this inventory. Don't shirk this responsibility.

39

4

You can effect the results only if you know what needs to be done, what is being done, and if you are on the spot when it is being done. You need to review the data when it is obtained, compare it, check it and test it with what you already have and from knowledgeable first-hand experience which you and your organization have.

If and when you find something wrong, try to get it changed. You usually can if you have a sound and factual basis for showing why changes are needed.

Certainly, it will be much more difficult to detect errors of this type and to get them corrected at the State level. At the National level this is virtually impossible.

So, in your own selfish interest, and in the interest of the well-being of future conservation programs in your county, do the best you can to have the current inventory reflect the factual situations as they exist in your counties.

Now, what about our long-term land use programs -- the Cronland Adjustment and the Cropland Conversion Programs? These programs are, and have been, intended to help people make adjustments -- and not just to adjust acreages of land. They were presented this way when Department witnesses testified for the enabling legislation, and when they asked for appropriations.

"People adjustment" means in particular, assistance to family farms operated by the aged and infirm, assistance to part-time operators who need to take advantage of off-farm job opportunities, assistance to young farmers who don't yet have a stake but who want to acquire a stake while living on the land and to go on and become the successful farmers of tomorrow.

The CAP goal for 1967 was 2,000,000 acres. The 1968 CAP included in the Department's budget would permit agreements on an additional 2,000,000 acres -- the same size as for 1967. Now, what about subsequent years?

Certainly, the future in agriculture is going to see changes as you have heard. Many of these will be more startling than the very significant changes which have taken place in the last thirty years -- and these have really been tremendous, if you stop for a moment and think about them.

There are few experts in the field who don't believe that the population in the world is going to double again in the relatively near future. Exactly when the population of this country again doubles is not worth debating for it is certain to be within the lifetime of many of us, and is, therefore, of interest and concern to us.

These additional fellow citizens of ours are going to want to be fed -- and they will be. Many of them will want outdoor recreation -- and they will get it. They will not only want the recreation and the additional food, but they will be willing and able to pay for it, -- at reasonable prices.

Both additional food and outdoor recreation requires the use of land -- most of which is in private ownership.

It seems to me, that if these two things are to be done without high cost to the consumer, Government assistance will be required -- even as it is today.

For example, based on 1964 statistics, there are 283 million acres in the United States devoted to outdoor recreation. However, one/sixth of this is in sparsely populated Alaska. 72 percent of the remainder is in the West, where only 15 percent of the people live.

The Northeast where one-fourth of all our people live has only four percent of the country's public recreation acreage.

The South and the North Central Regions which have 30 percent of the population have only 12 percent of the recreation acreage.

I believe that farmers will need assistance in the future in making land use adjustments, much as they need assistance today, whether: The 400 bushel per acre yielding corn now being obtained on an experimental basis becomes common in two or twenty years; whether 100 bushel wheat is harvested regularly across the United States next year or five years from now; when the breakthrough in soybean yields occurs; or when hybrid grass and legume seeds become a reality.

It is clear, of course, that what the provisions of future land use adjustment programs will be -- will have to be determined by subsequent Congresses.

Today, farmers are a small minority of our population and are getting smaller. City dwellers are a much larger group. And, of course, everyone is a consumer. In this wonderful, although sometimes imperfect, democracy in which we live, these different interest groups will have to reach an accommodation through their common representative -- Government. This accommodation need not be detrimental to farmers, if all of us, and particularly you, do our part in presenting facts to these groups, and to the Congress.

Whatever accommodation is reached, we can be certain of one thing. Elected farmer committees will play a major part in getting it put into effect.

The very fine record -- which you, and your colleagues in other States, have made over the past 30 years, assures that this will be true.

May I add my congratulations to the others already extended to you, for the fine work which you folks on the county committees, and in the county offices, and on the State Committee and in the State Office have done.

Also, for your very fine cooperation.

May I also express my thanks for the opportunity to have been again in attendance at your State Conference.

41

CURRENT DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Talk by A. F. Heald, USDA State Defense Board Chairman
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

The need for adequate defense preparations has never in recent years been greater than it is today. We are involved in an expanding struggle in Vietnam and we are committed to continue there as long as the Viet Cong persists in aggression against the South Vietnamese. The Vietnam war involves large numbers of men and large quantities of machines and other resources. All this necessarily has an impact on our economy. Also, and perhaps more significantly, it poses an increasing danger of more serious consequences.

As international tensions mount, whether from limited war such as Vietnam or from other causes, we are in greater danger of an all-out war which could involve the use of nuclear weapons.

The effects of nuclear war are hard to visualize. We need to deter such war from ever happening, and one of the best deterrents is an adequate defense. If an emergency should arise, defense preparedness will help to minimize the effect and to make it possible for our nation to survive.

In our defense preparations we must not ignore limited war, but we must pay particular attention to nuclear war, because the consequences could be so devastating and because, fortunately, we have had so little experience with it.

The U. S. Department of Agriculture has, as you know, significant defense responsibilities relating to food, rural fire defense, and many other subjects. The impact of any war involving nuclear weapons will be felt first at the county and State levels, so we look to our County and State Defense Boards as our first line of defense.

The board chairman provides leadership, management, direction and coordination of the defense boards. He and his board must be sure that USDA is properly represented at all times in dealings with outside agencies or groups and that there are standby plans to carry out functions which cannot be assigned completely to individual agencies.

In addition to serving as board chairman, the ASCS State Executive Director and the ASCS County Chairman are responsible for ASCS emergency program responsibilities which include emergency production programs, programs relating to the management of grain, and the distribution of seed, feed, fertilizer and farm equipment. At the county level the ASCS is also responsible for programs relating to food distribution, since the C&MS is not represented at the county level.

All this adds up to two basic points: First, we will succeed or fail in an emergency according to the effectiveness of our State and County Defense Boards; Second, our ASCS personnel play a big role in the success of our defense boards.

42

2

The important defense jobs of ASCS cannot be carried out by the State Executive Directors and County Chairmen acting alone. They must have the continued help and support of all ASCS personnel, including ASC committees. There are some functions which the ASC committees can carry out a little better than any other individual or group. For example, determining which farmers should get limited supplies of seed, feed, farm equipment or fertilizer can be done most effectively with the help of the committee.

We were pleased with the response of the Vermont USDA County Defense Boards to the readiness tests conducted during the past months. Through this series of exercises county boards are identifying weaknesses and learning how to strengthen defense readiness capability. In addition, board members are gaining valuable experience in working together as a team.

The most recent readiness exercise for the county boards covers food management information. It is hoped that the food management orders can be published in the Federal Register in the near future. At the State level there will be food management training conferences involving the food management member of the State Defense Board, his support staff and the State Defense Board chairman. Information and training gained in these meetings will help the State Board working with the County Defense Boards to improve ability to handle emergency food management problems. Copies of the food orders and supplemental guidance covering their use are being readied for the county boards.

As a part of the emergency resource management program carried out by State government, a Food Task Group was established in each State. In Vermont, as in other States, an emergency State food plan was prepared by the Food Task Group, assisted by a USDA State Defense Board representative. The Vermont emergency State food plan is scheduled for testing soon.

The Office of Civil Defense now has drafted a prototype food plan which will serve as a guide to county and local governments in carrying out their food management responsibilities in an emergency. This plan has just undergone testing in a west coast community. As a result of this test, the plan will be further refined before being issued as a prototype local food plan for use as a guide elsewhere in the nation. Once this plan is issued, County Defense Boards should work with county government officials to make certain that local food plans governing food at the retail and consumer levels are compatible with USDA food plans. One of the primary responsibilities of the USDA County Defense Board chairman is to foster a cooperative relationship with local government. This relationship will become even closer as the local food plan emerges.

Arrangements have been made to have Vern Tuxbury show a film just secured from Washington. The film depicts the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Mr. Tuxbury will introduce the film before he shows it.

SUMMARY OF COUNTY USDA DEFENSE BOARD EXERCISE, APRIL 3, 1967

Member's Designa- tion	Time Contacted After Receipt of State Office Call							Time to Report After Contact (Minutes)						
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>G</u>
<u>County</u>														
Addison	7	1	3	2	4	5		25	1	3	1	5	5	
Benn.	20	180	1		10	1		180	60	1		40	1	
Caled.	x	10	1			1		x	30	1			1	
Chitt.	x	x	2			4		x	x	10			15	
Essex	20	5	1			5		3	45	1			45	
Franklin	143	10	2	9		11	2	30	1	1	2		5	1
Gr. I.	77		290			127		8		20			15	
Lamoille	2	x	1	5		1		10	x	2	60		1	
Orange	30	x	3			7	5	90	x	2			60	30
Orleans	6	x	60	5		1	4	15	x	4	5		4	5
Rutland	25	39	3	41	12	29		10	60	1	6	2	15	
Wash.	15	x	x	2		2	2	45	x	x	2		2	2
Windham	7	84	2	22	25	300	3	75	30	1	60	90	1	1
Windsor	6	28	8		x	2	12	30	5	5		x	5	3

x - Unable to contact by 5:00 p.m.

A - ASCS

B - ARS

C - CES

D - FHA

E - FS

F - SCS

G - County Forester

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Annual Food Production and Requirements

County

Commodity (1)	Production (2)	Requirements *	Amount of	
			Excess (4)	Deficit (5)
Meat: Total				
Beef		XXX	XXX	XXX
Veal		XXX	XXX	XXX
Lamb & mutton		XXX	XXX	XXX
Pork		XXX	XXX	XXX
Chicken		XXX	XXX	XXX
Turkey		XXX	XXX	XXX
Eggs				
Milk (inc. butter)				
Cereal & cereal products				
Fruits & vegetables				
Potatoes				
Sugar & other sweeteners (include maple syrup)				

Prepared by County Defense Board on

from Part A "County Readiness Exercise" - For milk, the "food fats and oils" requirement is included. Milk converted to butter using 100 lbs. milk = 2.3 lbs. butter.

RECORD OF COUNTY DEFENSE BOARD MEETINGS *
1965 to Date

<u>County</u> (1)	<u>1965</u> (2)	<u>1966</u> (3)	<u>1967</u> <u>to date</u> (4)	<u>Date</u> <u>Last Meeting</u> (5)
Addison	1	3	0	November 8, 1966
Bennington	2	3	0	November 8, 1966
Caledonia	2	4	1	March 6, 1967
Chittenden	1	4	0	November 10, 1966
Essex	4	5	0	December 15, 1966
Franklin	3	4	2	March 20, 1967
Grand Isle	3	3	0	November 9, 1966
Lamoille	3	3	0	November 9, 1966
Orange	3	4	1	March 22, 1967
Orleans	3	4	1	March 27, 1967
Rutland	1	5	1	March 6, 1967
Washington	3	4	1	March 29, 1967
Windham	1	3	0	November 8, 1966
Windsor	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	February 16, 1967
Total	31	52	8	

* For discussion at State ASCS Conference April 20, 21, 1967

Summary of Talk by Richard Holmes,
Deputy Director, Civil Defense
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

Once again I am glad to be with the ASCS folks and discuss with you current activities in State civil defense work. We are very proud of the job agriculture has done, and we appreciate the close cooperation that the State and County Defense Boards have given to the civil defense organization in Vermont.

The defense food plans have progressed nicely and are just about complete. They will be tested out at an exercise on May 12. Mr. Heald and Mr. Tuxbury will be in attendance at this session.

Another major move that has been started is a survey of homes in Vermont to see how they are set up for protection against nuclear attack. The survey will be under way soon and will be completed in six weeks. Defense Boards will be kept up to date on the progress of the survey.

Comments by Vernon Tuxbury,
Extension Rural Defense Information Specialist
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

I am glad of this opportunity to meet with you ASCS folks. My particular job is to spread the word on civil defense activities among the rural citizens of Vermont. I am anxious to get to know the County Defense Board Chairmen and the office managers, and I want to repeat again that I will be glad to meet with you at any time at your Defense Board meetings.

I have had a chance to review this film which I am about to show. I think it will bring home to you more than words the devastation that can be brought about by nuclear bombs. Since we have a lot to cover today, I will get right into the showing of the film, "Damage to Hiroshima and Nagasaki in World War II."

Outline of Talk by Jack Davis, Coordinator,
White River Resource Conservation and Development Project
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

I. History of Resource Conservation and Development Projects

- A. Enabling Federal Legislation
Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 (P. L. 87-700)
Secretary's Memo #1515

II. What are Resource Conservation and Development Projects?

- A. RC&D - A Concept
- B. RC&D is a Way for Local People to:
 - 1. Inventory Resources
 - 2. Determine Problems
 - 3. Plan for Development of Resources
 - 4. Carry out the Plan
- C. Role of Federal and State Agencies
 - 1. USDA
 - 2. Other Federal
 - 3. State

III. The White River Resource Conservation and Development Project

- A. One of 10 Pilot Projects Nationwide
- B. Sponsors
- C. Location
- D. Resource Inventory and Problems
 - 1. Population Trend
 - 2. Economic Situation
 - a. Area
 - b. Agriculture
 - c. Forestry
 - d. Industry and Other
 - 3. Lack of Community Recreation and Other Facilities
 - 4. Water Resource Inventory
 - a. Potential Impoundment Sites
 - b. Need for Water Based Recreation
 - 5. Land Use
- E. The Project Plan - Solutions to Problems
 - 1. Objectives
 - a. Strengthen the Family Farm

1. Soil Survey - acceleration
 2. Conservation Planning - acceleration
 3. Land Treatment - acceleration
 4. Farm Management Counseling - acceleration
 5. New or Supplemental Farm Enterprises
- b. Create New Income through Recreational and Industrial Enterprises
1. The Market
 - a. Interstate Highways
 2. Project Measures Designed to Meet Objectives
 - a. Private Income Producing Recreation
 - b. Public and Community Recreation Projects
 - c. Improve and Bring About New Community Facilities
 1. Regional Planning
 2. Town Resource Inventory and Resource Planning
 3. Above Items will Generate:
 - a. Town and Community Recreation Areas
 - Plans to Stimulate
Financial Assistance
 - b. Better Economic Climate

F. Conclusion

1. Summarize

Emphasis on Need of ASCS Help

Discussion led by A. F. Heald,
State Executive Director
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

Mr. Heald discussed various administrative aspects of the Agricultural Conservation Program, the Cropland Adjustment Program, and the Conservation Reserve Program. In addition, he reviewed in detail the summary of community committee recommendations from all counties. Copies of material reviewed follow.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS *
All Counties

1968 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM **

A PROGRAM POLICIES

The general program principles are outlined in the current State or County Practice Handbook. What are your comments on these principles?

All 14 counties voted for the same program principles as in 1967.

B PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

In keeping with the program policies, what practices and cost-share rates are recommended for 1968? (Use last year's practices as a basis for discussion. When establishing cost-shares for mineral practices, make a thorough comparison of contract costs vs. cash practices and use this in determining the cost-share rates.)

Practice A-2 - New Seeding

11 counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1967; one voted to raise the cost-share for superphosphate; one voted to offer the same cost-share for phosphorus and for potash; and one county voted to have the same cost-share for phosphorus and for potash, whether in nitrogen-carrying or non-nitrogen-bearing fertilizer.

Cost-share: All counties agreed to cost-share mixed fertilizer, superphosphate, and potash on a 2/3-1/3 basis, with the farmer paying the 2/3. See table below for obstruction removal.

Table of 1967 Rates with Recommendations for 1968
for Practice A-2(g)

County	<u>Obstruction Removal</u>	
	Actual 1967 and Proposed 1968	
Addison	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$150 farm
Bennington	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$200 farm
Caledonia	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$100 farm
Chittenden	40% NTE	\$15 A or \$75 farm
Essex	40% NTE	\$20 A or \$120 farm
Franklin	40% NTE	\$75 farm
Grand Isle	40% NTE	\$25 A
Lamoille	40% NTE	\$20 A or \$100 farm
Orange	40% NTE	\$20 A or \$120 farm
Orleans	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$100 farm
Rutland	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$100 farm
Washington	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$100 farm
Windham	40% NTE	\$25 A or \$200 farm
Windsor	40% NTE	\$25 A

* For review at the 1967 State ASCS Conference.

** The questions listed are those discussed at the ASCS Program Planning Meetings in March of 1967.

52

2

Practice A-4 - Lime

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: See table below.

Table on 1967 Rates with Recommendations for 1968
for Practice A-4

			<u>Lime</u>		
County	Gov. % of BS Cost		County	Gov. % of BS Cost	
	Actual	Proposed		Actual	Proposed
	1967	1968		1967	1968
Addison	50	50	Lamoille	49	50
Bennington	48	48	Orange	50	50
Caledonia	50	50	Orleans	47	47
Chittenden	50	50	Rutland	46	46
Essex	47	47	Washington	49	49
Franklin	45	49	Windham	PO	PO
Grand Isle	50	50	Windsor	49	49

Practice A-5 - Stripcropping

Ten counties voted to offer the same practice as in 1967; three once more agreed not to offer the practice; and one county which offered it in 1967 does not plan to do so in 1968.

Cost-share: Ten counties voted for the same cost-share as in 1967.

Practice A-7 - Planting Trees

13 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1967, and one county voted to delete "locust trees" from the species listed in the practice description.

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

Practice B-1 - Improving Hay or Pasture

All counties voted to offer this practice as in 1967 with changes in cost-sharing as shown under Practice A-2. In addition, one county voted to delete contract potash, and another voted that the cost-share for contract potash be the same as for cash practice phosphorus and potash.

Cost-share: All counties agreed to cost-share mixed fertilizer, superphosphate, and potash on a 2/3-1/3 basis, with the farmer paying the 2/3.

Table of 1967 Rates with Recommendations for 1968
for Practices A-7 and B-10

County	Planting Trees		Woodland Improvement Cost-share (a)	
	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed
	1967	1968	1967	1968
Add.	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Benn.	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$12 A	70% NTE \$12 A
Cal.	70% NTE \$25 M ₁ /	70% NTE \$25 M ₁ /	70% NTE \$15 A ₁ /	70% NTE \$15 A ₁ /
Chitt.	70% NTE \$25 M	60% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$12 A	70% NTE \$12 A
Essex	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$12 A	70% NTE \$12 A
Frank.	70% NTE \$25 M	60% NTE \$25 A	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$15 A
Gr. I.	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$25 M	70% NTE \$20 A	70% NTE \$20 A
Lam.	70% NTE \$25 M ₂ /	50% NTE \$20 M ₂ /	70% NTE \$15 A ₂ /	70% NTE \$12 A ₂ /
Orange	\$25 M	\$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A ₃ /	70% NTE \$15 A ₃ /
Orleans	70% NTE \$15 M ₄ /	\$15 M ₄ /	70% NTE \$15 A ₄ /	70% NTE \$15 A ₄ /
Rutland	\$25 M	\$25 M	70% NTE \$15 A	70% NTE \$12 A
Wash.	70% NTE \$20 M ₅ /	\$20 M ₈ /	6/	6/
Windh.	70% NTE \$20 M ₇ /	70% NTE \$20 M ₇ /	50% NTE \$12 A ₇ /	50% NTE \$12 A ₇ /
Winds.	70% NTE \$20 M	60% NTE \$20 M	70% NTE \$12 A	70% NTE \$12 A

1/ \$250 per farm or \$500 per person.

2/ 5 acres each for tree planting and TSI, NTE \$400 to any one owner.

3/ 25 acres per farm.

4/ \$450 per owner for forestry practices, regardless of number of farms involved.

5/ \$100 farm limit.

6/ 70% NTE \$15 A for thinning, removing, and killing and NTE \$10 A for aerial spraying, and 50% NTE \$15 A for pruning, with a farm limit of \$300.

7/ 20 acre limit on forestry practices.

8/ Limit of \$150.

Practice B-6 - Springs or Seeps

12 counties voted for the same practice as in 1967. One county voted to delete cost-share (b) and the two paragraphs in the practice description relating to pipe, troughs, etc., and to insert instead the statement: "Any necessary pipelines may be authorized under Practice B-8." Another county voted not to limit cost-sharing to cow pumps but to permit any kind of pump with a cost-share limit of \$35.

Cost-share: 13 counties voted for a cost-share of 50% of the cost, and one county voted for 50% for (a) and 40% for (b). These are the same cost-shares as in 1967.

54

4

Practice B-7 - Farm Ponds

11 counties voted for the same practice as in 1967. One county recommended deleting cost-shares (c) and (d) relating to cow pumps, pipe, etc. and to add the following sentence to the practice description: "If the farm pond is for livestock water, Practice B-8 must be carried out in conjunction with this practice." Another county recommended increasing cost-share (a) to 50%, deleting from the practice description the two sentences regarding valves and pumps, and inserting "Any necessary pipelines may be authorized under Practice B-8." Another county voted not to limit cost-sharing to cow pumps but to permit any kind of pump with a cost-share limit of \$35.

Cost-share: See table below.

Table of 1967 Rates with Recommendations for 1968
for Practice B-7

County	<u>Farm Ponds</u>	
	Cost-share (a) Actual 1967	Cost-share (a) Proposed 1968
Add.	40%	40%
Benn.	40% <u>1/</u>	40% <u>1/</u>
Cal.	40%	40%
Chitt.	40% NTE \$100 dug or \$300 dam	40% NTE \$100 dug or \$300 dam
Essex	40% <u>2/</u>	40% <u>2/</u>
Frank.	40% NTE \$150 per pond	40% NTE \$150 per pond
Gr. I.	40%	40%
Lam.	40% <u>3/</u>	40% <u>3/</u>
Orange	40% <u>4/</u>	40% <u>4/</u>
Orl.	40% <u>5/</u>	50% <u>5/</u>
Rut.	40% NTE \$200 per farm	40% NTE \$200 per farm
Wash.	40% <u>6/</u>	40% <u>6/</u>
Windh.	40% <u>7/</u>	40% <u>7/</u>
Winds.	40% NTE \$400 per farm <u>8/</u>	40% NTE \$400 per farm <u>8/</u>

- 1/ Total cost-sharing for the practice NTE \$300 per farm.
- 2/ Owner must have had at least 10 animal units on farm during previous year.
- 3/ Total cost-sharing for the practice NTE \$150 per farm.
- 4/ Total cost-sharing for the practice NTE \$400 per farm. To be eligible, primary source of income is agricultural products.
- 5/ Total cost-sharing for the practice NTE \$200 for dug or \$300 for dam ponds.
- 6/ Total cost-sharing for the practice NTE \$400 per farm. If Practice B-8 is needed, it will be in addition to this limit.
- 7/ Total cost-sharing for the practice NTE \$200 per farm.
- 8/ To be eligible, farmer must have livestock or orchard.

Practice B-8 - Pipelines

11 counties voted for the same practice as in 1967. One county voted to include cow pumps, another to include cow pumps and check valves as in Practice B-6, and one to permit any kind of pump with a cost-share limit of \$35.

Cost-share: As in 1967, 12 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one for 40%. The remaining county voted for the following cost-shares: (a) 50% of the cost of installed pipe; (b) 50% of the cost of collection trough and float valve, or drinking bowls, or cow pumps.

Practice B-10 - Woodland Improvement

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: See table on page 3.

Practice C-1 - Sod Waterways

All counties voted to continue this practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: All counties voted to continue the present cost-share.

Practice C-5 - Diversion Ditch

All counties^{voted}/for this practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: All counties voted for the same cost-share as in 1967.

Practice C-7 - Channel Lining

13 counties voted to continue this practice and one county not to offer it, as in 1967.

Cost-share: As in 1967, 12 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one for 40%.

Practice C-8 - Streambank Protection

All counties voted for the same practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: Ten counties voted for a 50% cost-share for (a) and (b); three counties voted for 50% for (a) and \$3 a tree for (b); and one county voted for 50% for (a) and \$3 a tree 12-23" and \$4 a tree 24" and over. These are the same cost-shares as in 1967.

Practice C-9 - Open Drainage

All 14 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: As in 1967, 13 counties voted to offer 50% of the cost and one voted for 40%.

56

-6

Practice C-10 - Tile Drainage

All 14 counties voted for the same practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: As in 1967, 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one voted for 40%.

Practice C-11 - Land Grading

All 14 counties voted to continue this practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: As in 1967, 13 counties voted for a 50% cost-share and one voted for 40%.

Practice F-1 - Special Conservation Practices

Eleven counties will offer special practices under this provision.
Three counties will not do so.

Practice F-1(a) - Green Manure

Two counties which offered this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Caledonia and Windham Counties)

Practice F-1(b) - Mulching

Four counties which offered this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Addison, Bennington, Grand Isle and Windham Counties)

Practice F-1(c) - Shrub Control

One county which offered this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Windham County) Another county which had the practice in 1967 voted to discontinue it in 1968. (Chittenden County)

Practice F-1(d) - Wild Tree Improvement

Seven counties offering this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Caledonia, Essex, Lamoille, Orange, Orleans, Rutland and Washington Counties) One of these counties recommended that the practice include plantations as well as wild stands.

Practice F-2 - County Conservation Practices

All counties voted to offer this provision.

Practice F-2(a) - Super with Manure

All counties voted to continue this practice as in 1967.

Cost-share: All counties agreed to cost-share superphosphate on a $\frac{2}{3}$ - $\frac{1}{3}$ basis, with the farmer paying the $\frac{2}{3}$.

Practice F-3 - New Conservation Problems

Two counties voted to offer this provision; the remaining 12 voted not to do so.

Practice F-4 - Emergency Conservation Measures

One county voted to include this provision; the remaining 13 voted not to do so.

Practice G-2 - Shallow Water Areas

Five counties which offered this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. One county which offered it in 1967 voted to add the following to the practice description: "No Federal cost-sharing will be allowed for constructing shallow water areas which will impound water on areas that will be drained periodically for the production of crops when the purpose is primarily to improve the area for hunting." The remaining eight counties voted not to offer it.

Cost-share: The six counties voted for the same cost-share of 50% as in 1967. One of these set a limit of \$150 per farm, and another \$300.

Practice G-3 - Wildlife Ponds

11 counties offering this practice in 1967 voted to offer it again in 1968. The remaining three counties once more voted not to offer this practice.

Cost-share: Ten counties voted for the same cost-share (a) of 40% as in 1967, and one county recommended increasing this to 50%. One set a limit of \$150 per farm; one, \$200 per pond; one, \$200 per land owner; one, \$150 for the practice; two, \$200 per farm; the remaining counties set these conditions:

- a \$300 limit and applicant must have owned property for three years and main source of income must be from sale of agricultural products.
- b \$150 per pond and farm must be actively managed for pasture, hay crops, or woodland.
- c \$200 for a dug pond and \$300 for a dam pond including spreading the spoil, seeding, and pipeline. In addition, the farmer must have owned the land for three years as of July 1 and must have a going dairy, poultry, or woodland farm.
- d \$400 limit and the farm must have been owned by the applicant at least three years using October 31 as cutoff date, and must have carried out at least one additional practice in previous year.

Practice G-4 - Other Wildlife Practices

Eleven counties voted to offer this provision; the remaining three voted not to offer it.

58

8

Practice G-4(a) - Land Management

Ten counties voted to offer this practice as in 1967; one of these recommended changing the wording "This practice is applicable only to farming units and includes" to read "This practice includes"; and another of these recommended that the State office clarify the description as above and also that paragraph (1) should read: "Mowing land previously hayed up to within 50 feet of woodland or land in brush or fencing to preserve the habitat of open land forms of wildlife." One county which offered the practice in 1967 voted to discontinue it in 1968, and one county which did not offer it in 1967 voted to do so in 1968. (Not offered in Essex and Windham Counties).

Cost-share: All 11 counties voted for the same cost-share of 50% as in 1967. One county set a per farm limit of \$100; another, \$200; one, a limit of \$150 for the practice; one, a limit of \$4 per acre; and one, a limit of \$5 per acre and the farm must have been owned at least one year using October 31 as the cutoff date and the land must have been mechanically harvested within the last five years.

Practice H - Beautification Conservation Practices

Five counties voted to include this provision, and the remaining nine counties voted not to offer it.

Practice H-1 - Seeding Borrow Pits

Four counties offering this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Caledonia, Chittenden, Orleans and Rutland Counties)

Practice H-2 - Roadside TSI

Four counties offering this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Caledonia, Chittenden, Orleans, and Rutland Counties)

Cost-share: Three counties voted for the same cost-share as in 1967, and one county voted to change the cost-share to \$20 per $\frac{1}{4}$ acre.

Practice H-3 - Border Plantings

Two counties which offered this practice in 1967 voted to continue it in 1968. (Caledonia, and Orleans Counties.)

Cost-share: Both counties voted for a cost-share of 50% as in 1967, with one limiting it to \$100 per site and the other to \$150 per site.

C OPERATING POLICIES

1 What arrangements should be made for enrolling farmers in the program?

13 counties voted for farm-to-farm visits and one for sign-up meetings. All 14 counties will permit sign-up in the county office.

2 A recent survey shows that there are over 1,000 farms in our State that did not participate in ACP during 1960-1965. How do we reach this group?

One county suggested imprinting on a 245 the name of every known farm in the county and giving these forms to the committeemen; two others recommended urging committeemen to be sure all farmers are contacted; three reported that all farmers are now being visited; three counties reported no problem; and five had no suggestions.

3 What are your suggestions in connection with breaking down the use of program funds among farmers?

Ten counties recommended leaving this up to the county committee, and four counties voted to use the present method.

4 Should technical service costs paid for by ACP be considered in the farm limit?

Seven counties voted "No," two counties recommended leaving it up to the county committee, four voted to do the same as in 1967, and one stated it was not a problem.

5 What should our soil test requirements be?

Five counties agreed to continue present requirements; two counties recommend soil tests; the remaining seven commented as follows:

- a Lime - needs; to use 2 tons per acre unless soil test shows less is needed. Must use lime on land treated with fertilizer unless soil test shows pH of 6.2 or more.
- b Lime - no test, 2 tons per acre; with test, amount needed. For new seeding and topdressing pH 5.0 to 5.9 - 2 tons lime per acre; 6.0 to 6.5 - 1 ton per acre; no test - 2 tons per acre.
- c pH 6.5 or over for seeding; 6.0 or over for topdressing.
- d 2 tons lime per acre unless soil test shows otherwise, or according to complete soil test requirements.
- e Soil test required before approval for fertilizer unless lime is being used currently or soil test has been received showing pH of at least 6.5.
- f Lime as needed; fertilizer payments require use of one ton of lime per acre of fertilizer paid for unless soil test shows no lime is needed.
- g Lime - test required for over 5 tons. Fertilizer - not required, encourage soil tests.

6 Conservation Materials and Services

a Should we continue to furnish conservation materials under contract in 1968 as we did in 1967?

All 14 counties voted "Yes."

LIME	County	Size of Bag	Type of Delivery			
			<u>Bagged F.Y.</u>	<u>Bagged Siding</u>	<u>Bulk- spread</u>	<u>FOB Plant</u>
	Addison	80	x		x	x
	Bennington	80	x		x	
	Caledonia	80	x	x	x	
	Chittenden	80	x		x	
	Essex	80	x		x	
	Franklin	80	x		x	
	Grand Isle	80	x		x	
	Lamoille	80		x	x	
	Orange	80	x	x	x	x
	Orleans	100	x	x	x	
	Rutland	80	x		x	x
	Washington	80	x	x	x	
	Windham		Purchase Order			x
	Windsor	80	x		x	x

SUPER Type of Delivery - One county voted for bagged siding; three for bagged farmyard and one of these is willing to pay \$5 a ton more for this type of delivery; one, for bagged farmyard and FOB plant; one, for bagged siding and bagged farmyard; and one, for bagged siding and FOB plant.

Seven counties voted to leave the decision to the county committee based on the results of bids for bagged siding and bagged farmyard.

MIXED	County	<u>15-15-15</u>	<u>0-10-30</u>	<u>0-25-25</u>	<u>Bagged Siding</u>	<u>Bagged F.Y.</u>	<u>FOB Plant</u>
	Addison	x	x	x		x	x
	Bennington	x	x	x		x	
	Caledonia <u>1/</u>		x	x		x	x
	Chittenden <u>2/</u>	x	x	x			
	Essex	x	x	x		x	x
	Franklin <u>2/</u>	x	x	x			
	Grand Isle <u>3/</u>			x		x	x
	Lamoille	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Orange <u>2/</u>	x	x	x			
	Orleans <u>2/</u>	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Rutland <u>2/</u>	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Washington	x	x	x		x	x
	Windham	Purchase Order					
	Windsor <u>2/</u>	x	x	x			

- 1/ County committee will determine about offering 15-15-15 based on cost and will also check the cost of bulksread under contract.
2/ County committee will determine type of delivery based on bids.
3/ Also wish to offer 0-20-10 and 0-30-10.

POTASH	County	<u>Farmyard</u>	<u>FOB Plant</u>
	Addison	x	
	Bennington	x	
	Caledonia		x
	Chittenden		x
	Essex		x
	Franklin*		
	Grand Isle	Not to be offered	
	Lamoille	x	
	Orange*		
	Orleans*	x	x
	Rutland	x	x
	Washington	x	x
	Windham	Not to be offered	
	Windsor	Not to be offered	

*County committee will determine type of delivery.

C 6 b Explanation of Purchase Order Plan

c Cost-share Rate for Purchase Orders (and Cash Practices)
Fertilizer. In the past, some counties have set up cash practice payment rates for fertilizer (thus purchase orders) higher than for contract materials. Should this be continued?

One county voted "No," and four voted "Yes." Eight had no comment and one recommended that the rates for cash practice and contract material be the same.

Indicate the type of material or service to be furnished under the Purchase Order Plan?

<u>Kind of Material or Service</u>	<u>Reply</u>	<u>No. Counties</u>
(1) Planting forest trees	Yes	12
	No	2
(2) Woodland improvement	Yes	13
	No	1
(3) Earth moving	Yes	14
	No	0
(4) Lime	Yes	12
	No	2
(5) Mixed fertilizer	Yes	13
	No	1
(6) Other (specify)		
Potash	Yes	1

d Should we continue the soil sampling service?

Yes 9 as in 1967.
 No 5 (Two of these voted "Yes" in 1967.)

One county recommended the use of quicktest kits by community committeemen for lime, as in 1967.

D ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS

One county recommended that some changes be made in community boundaries.

SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS
WHICH DIFFER FROM
COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS *
All Counties

1968 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM **

B PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

Practice H-4 - Maintaining Open Land

Federal cost-share: 50 percent of the cost not to exceed \$3 per acre payable only once during a three calendar year period

Practice must be eligible land as an individual owner undertaking or as a community project.

To be eligible, the lands must be adjacent to a public highway and cost-sharing assistance shall not extend to areas beyond 1000 feet of the highway. Lands may be maintained open by use of any type of machinery which cuts vegetation to at least a six-inch height.

This practice is applicable only to lands formerly used for hay or crops within the past ten years. (Bennington County)

Practice G-3 - Wildlife Ponds

Remove restriction that the other practice would have to be done in previous years to be eligible. (Windsor County)

*For review at the 1967 State ASCS Conference.

**The questions listed are those discussed at the ASCS Program Planning Meetings in March of 1967.

Wildlife Practices
(Data furnished by counties March 1967)

County	Shallow Water Areas				Ponds				Managing Land				Cutback Borders			
	1966 ACP		1967 ACP		1966 ACP		1967 ACP		1966 ACP		1967 ACP		1966 ACP		1967 ACP	
	Requests	Com- pleted	Requests	Appr	Requests	Com- pleted	Requests	Appr	Requests	Com- pleted	Requests	Appr	Requests	Com- pleted	Requests	Appr
Addison	0	0	1	1	25	22	14	14	4	4	10	9	*	*	*	*
Bennington	0	0	*	*	11	11	10	10	*	*	0	0	*	*	*	*
Caledonia	0	0	*	*	25	5	16	5	0	0	1	0	4	4	1	1
Chittenden	0	0	1	1	19	15	8	4	*	*	1	1	0	0	0	0
Essex	*	*	*	*	4	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Franklin	0	0	0	0	11	1	11	3	*	*	0	0	*	*	*	*
Grand Isle	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Lamoille	*	*	*	*	30	5	29	0	16	3	13	0	*	*	*	*
Orange	0	0	0	0	42	22	27	20	5	2	4	3	4	3	1	1
Orleans	*	*	*	*	30	17	13	8	*	*	5	0	*	*	*	*
Rutland	1	0	2	2	38	19	45	45	*	*	7	7	*	*	*	*
Washington	*	*	*	*	31	29	*	*	7	7	14	8	*	*	*	*
Windham	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Windsor	*	*	*	*	39	19	42	20	*	*	19	19	*	*	*	*
Totals	1	0	5	4	309	173	215	129	32	16	74	47	8	7	2	2

* Not offered

Status of 1965 ACP Funds

County	Base Allocation (1)	Estimated SCI (2)	1964 Deficit (3)	Net 1965 Funds Available (4)	Amount Paid at State Office (5)	Sight Draft Limitation Including SCI (6)	Deficit (7)
Addison	124,138	4,728	17,642	111,224	59,782	57,842	6,400
Bennington	36,488	2,200		38,688	10,339	29,564	1,215
Caledonia	85,590	4,604	3,846	86,348	29,406	65,624	8,682
Chittenden	89,330	3,845	11,262	81,913	43,473	54,599	16,159
Essex	20,192	809		21,001	7,133	17,480	3,612
Franklin	136,449	6,484	6,232	136,701	72,853	63,441	--
Grand Isle	21,511	1,023	2,460	20,074	9,826	9,600	--
Lamoille	52,499	3,527		56,026	21,856	41,861	7,691
Orange	85,059	4,999	17,257	72,801	47,384	58,250	32,833
Orleans	119,030	4,042	69	123,603	49,441	85,663	11,501
Rutland	97,764	4,250		102,014	52,153	49,300	--
Washington	73,142	4,370	1,042	76,470	34,994	37,980	--
Windham	49,305	2,348	700	50,953	5,979	44,555	--
Windsor	84,503	4,171	3,123	85,551	35,742	47,848	--
Total	1,075,000	52,000	63,633	1,063,367	480,361	663,607	88,093

(1) From Vermont Notice ACP-38 and memo of 9-30-66 to Addison and Windsor Counties.

(2) Preliminary estimate adjusted to State total.

(3) As shown on tabulation discussed at September 1966 COM Conference.

(4) Column 1 plus Column 2 minus Column 3.

(5) From Vermont Notice ACP-49 adjusted by transfers from 1965 to 1966 ACP.

(6) Current limitation.

(7) Column 4 minus Column 5 minus Column 6. This is the figure to be shown in Item 2 of Vt-ACP-1 when requesting 1966 ACP S/D limitation. It may be adjusted when payments under 1965 ACP are completed, if Column 6 changes.

Vermont State ASCS Office
April 1967

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM *
as of April 13, 1967

<u>County</u> (1)	<u>Number</u> <u>Requests</u> (2)	<u>Acres</u> <u>Offered</u> (3)	<u>Estimated</u> <u>Adjustment Payments</u> (4)
Addison	1	30	\$ 1006
Bennington	6	250	3651
Caledonia	7	151	1208
Chittenden	5	281	6528
Essex	1	75	600
Franklin	2	78	876
Grand Isle	6	147	3714
Lamoille	1	43	573
Orange	14	244	5791
Orleans	6	365	3260
Rutland	3	159	1633
Washington	8	157	1256
Windham	0	-	-
Windsor	<u>5</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>3002</u>
Total	65	2132	\$33098

* For discussion at State ASCS Conference April 20, 21, 1967

WOOL, FEED GRAIN, AND WHEAT

Discussion led by G. T. Hart, Fieldman
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

Mr. Hart reviewed the following programs, covering items of an administrative nature for the most part.

Wool Program

It was ascertained that all counties have received the wool application for payment listing sheets from DPC, and for the most part, the managers are satisfied with the functioning of the new system. All but two counties have completed wool payments for the 1966 marketing year, and these two counties will complete payments in the very near future.

Feed Grain Program

The surplus in feed grains has been reduced from 85 million tons of carryover in 1960 to about 47 million tons in 1966, and it is expected that the carryover will be reduced to about 30 million tons by the end of 1967.

The review and signing of Form ASCS-477, "Intention to Participate and Application for Payment," was discussed. It was suggested that county committees review each intention filed so that they are fully informed as to who is participating and what their diversion payments will be. The committeemen should satisfy themselves that each applicant's participation meets the purposes of the program.

Mr. Hart reviewed the new instructions regarding the reduction in diversion payments where the producers offer substantially below average land. It was concluded that the reporters should inform their county committees in any cases where low fertility or a low state of production is noted in the land offered by participants.

The need for continual checking to assure that the farms in the county are properly constituted was emphasized. The recent amendment to Reconstitution Handbook 3-PA was noted, and county office managers were urged to study the details of this amendment and to make sure that these instructions are being followed in regard to farm reconstitutions.

County office managers were urged to make arrangements with their reporters to make the necessary farm visits as soon as possible, particularly for farms participating in the Cropland Adjustment Program. Managers were urged to properly prepare Form 578 for use of the reporters and to supply them with any sketches of land that was in the Feed Grain Program last year.

The accepting of late-filed requests for participation in programs was discussed. It was concluded that producers should be notified of deadlines and the conditions for accepting late-filed requests. Farmers should be

68 2
informed that they may file a request for participation after the closing date, but that the acceptance of these requests will be up to the county committee and will be determined by the current instructions for the program.

Wheat Program

There are no farms in Vermont participating in the Wheat Program this year. County office managers were reminded that there will soon be work to do on the 1968 wheat allotments in the five counties which have wheat farms.

1967 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM *

<u>County</u> <u>(1)</u>	<u>Enrolled</u> <u>Farms</u> <u>(2)</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Feed</u> <u>Grain</u> <u>Base</u> <u>(3)</u>	<u>Enrolled</u> <u>Feed</u> <u>Grain</u> <u>Base</u> <u>(4)</u>	<u>Intended</u> <u>Diversion</u> <u>(5)</u>
Addison	19	9275	334	300
Bennington	20	2374	325	243
Caledonia	23	1904	183	183
Chittenden	37	6990	561	480
Essex	0	121	-	-
Franklin	16	6179	259	228
Grand Isle	6	2593	76	76
Lamoille	9	1430	109	109
Orange	23	2696	267	233
Orleans	13	1745	134	126
Rutland	43	5757	614	518
Washington	27	1910	271	266
Windham	6	3089	79	76
Windsor	<u>0</u>	<u>3306</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	242	49369	3212	2838
U.S. **	1,292,666	115,147,900	65,655,500	20,175,000

* For discussion at State ASCS Conference April 20, 21, 1967

** U.S. totals represent about 95% of 1966 enrollment

70

COUNTY ELECTIONS, AND OPTICAL SCANNING

Discussion led by Edson E. Gifford, Jr., Fieldman
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

County Elections

Mr. Gifford distributed a sheet entitled, "Tentative 1967 Election Procedure Recommendations - For Discussion Purposes Only." A lively discussion followed, particularly with the tentative requirement that boundaries be set so that all communities contain equal numbers of farmers. The recommendation that all elections in the Nation be held the third week in September also brought considerable discussion and debate.

It was pointed out that these recommendations are tentative. Final election procedures will be made official and sent to counties later in the summer.

Optical Scanning

A sheet outlining the objectives, purpose and operation of the optical scanning system was distributed and discussed briefly. Counties reported no major difficulty in the system so far as it is operating in Vermont.

Copies of the material reviewed follow.

Tentative 1967 Election Procedure Recommendations
for Discussion Purposes Only *

1. In the nominating process, require that community committeemen first decide whether any or all of them will be candidates. If either two or three are to be nominees, the community committee can make no further nominations and the county committee must complete the slate. If only one is to be a nominee, the remaining two can complete the slate.
2. Include an exhibit covering voting instructions for community and county elections which must be reproduced for mailings to eligible voters. Also, provide a mandatory ballot format to be reproduced at the State or county levels.
3. Place names on the ballot in the same form as the nominee signs the certification of his willingness to serve. Also put a statement on the certification that the nominee's name will be listed on the ballot in the same form as he signs the certification.
4. Require that community boundaries be set so that all communities within a county contain equal numbers of farmers within a 15% tolerance. If this is not practical, provide proportional voting in the county convention. The number of votes allotted to community committees would be determined by the proportion of eligible voters in each community to the total in the county. Provide that there can be not more than one county committeeman from any one community except for counties having less than three communities.
5. Hold all ASC elections in the Nation during the third week in September. State committees will determine the dates committeemen will take office which shall not be later than the first working day after January 1.
6. The county committee shall allow any bona fide candidate to take a position close enough to the vote counting process to both see and hear the entire proceedings. The county committee is not obligated to provide for such observance of the vote counting, however, unless specifically requested by the candidate. He may request to observe the counting himself, or to have his designee, who must be an eligible voter in the county, observe it.
7. Check unopened envelopes for other ASCS papers right after votes are counted, rather than 15 days after the county convention.
8. Make lists of eligible voters by community available for inspection in the county office 45 days before elections.
9. Require that only county committee chairmen or acting chairmen be present at the county convention to open the meeting and then be allowed to leave after a permanent chairman is elected. We now require that all incumbent committeemen remain available to the convention to settle questions.

* Tentative - for discussion only.

10. Redesign the election ballot certification to reduce instances where farmers fail to sign it. This will be done by changing the format of the certification slightly and using a red arrow to point to the line where the voter is to sign.
11. Redesign Form ASCS-587 so that only one signature is required. This can be done by using blocks for check marks rather than two separate signatures. We propose to combine in one sentence the agreement to be a nominee and the willingness to serve if elected. Also, provide for address of nominee and name of community.
12. Not require secret written ballots at community election meetings when there is only one nominee.
13. Send Form ASCS-584 to the State office immediately after the ballots are tabulated rather than within 5 days following the county convention. Also, include tabulation of votes received by defeated candidates.
14. Eliminate requirement for an election ballot when one nominee receives majority on the nominating ballot. (County conventions and meeting type elections.)
15. Paragraph 69 A 2 - Use words "the person receiving the most on the election ballot shall be elected" instead of the word "plurality".
16. Provide a special form for community committees to report their slates of nominees.

OPTICAL SCANNING*

OBJECTIVES:

1. To furnish IRS the name and address of all payees - Social Security or account numbers - name control - total payments received from ASCS programs.
2. To furnish farmers a statement of total payments received beginning with the 1967 calendar year.
3. To establish and maintain a producer's name and address file on magnetic tape.
4. To consolidate and simplify document transmittals, reduce paper flow, and centralize mailing points.
5. To reduce expensive processing operations in NOCO and KCDPC.
6. To provide accounting data for a wide range of reports.

PURPOSE:

1. System was developed for reporting of individual payments to IRS and to the producer or farmer.
2. To reduce the expensive key punch operation in DPC's.
3. To provide more accurate accounting data recorded in a manner by which a wide range of reports can be quickly assembled at a minimum cost.

OPERATION:

The scanner will translate printed data on documents, drafts, etc. to magnetic tape for permanent record purposes.

*For discussion at State Conference - April 21, 1967.

COUNTY INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

74

Discussion led by Richard A. Moore,
Chairman, State ASC Committee
at the State ASCS Conference
Burlington, Vermont, April 21, 1967

Mr. Moore distributed a sheet entitled, "Some Suggestions for 1967 County Informational Meetings," and pointed out that this list was intended as a starting point to help counties in planning such meetings.

County representatives agreed to hold informational meetings this year and will develop programs from the suggestions or will develop their own topics.

Counties were asked to notify the State Office of their plans on or before May 8.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR 1967 COUNTY INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS *

A. What To Do

1. A study of the watershed approach to conservation and a visit to areas.

This might be particularly applicable to Chittenden and Lamoille Counties where they can visit the Browns River area; and Windsor County where they can visit the Jewell Brook area.

2. A study of lime or fertilizer production and distribution by visiting local plants.
3. A review of selected ACP practices in the installation stage, such as obstruction removal, open or tile drainage, spring development or installing pipelines, and timber stand improvement.
4. A study of special land use practices at the county level; for example, the practice for improving land use in former pasture areas.

This could be in the form of a discussion of the practice in the forenoon and a visit to farms in the afternoon.

5. Making good use of wildlife practices.

This could be in the form of a discussion in the morning and a visit to selected farms illustrating the practice in the afternoon. If possible, local Fish and Game Club representatives should be invited in to the meeting.

6. A meeting on the theme of "What We Are Doing for Your Community."

This could be a joint farmer-businessman session to review ACP accomplishments in the county.

7. Soil testing.

Jerry McIntosh could bring the committeemen up to date on the recently changed laboratory procedures and testing and some of the details relative to the prescription writing concept, as well as the new types of fertilizer material handling and mixing.

8. Water resources.

The problem of cleaning up Vermont streams seems to have stepped up and the primary responsibility lies with the Department of Water Resources. Individual landowners will have responsibilities here and perhaps Bud Thieme would be a man here.

* For discussion at State ASCS Conference, April 21, 1967

9. Forest management possibilities.

Ray Foulds has been working in this field and there are several new research studies that could be interpreted in terms of individual responsibilities and possibilities.

10. Cropland Conversion Program.

A visit to Morris LaFrance's farm in Randolph Center to review the Cropland Conversion Program in operation.

11. Recreation developments.

A review of recreation developments conducted by Mr. Lindsay or Mr. Bevins of the Extension staff.

B. When

Anytime after May 8. We would prefer to get the meetings completed by June 30.

We can schedule meetings after July 1 if counties so desire and if administrative funds are available.

C. Action Needed

Counties should think these suggestions over or think up other things that they would rather do. Discuss the ideas with the county agent, SCS technician and county forester. Let the State Office know by May 8 what you want to do and when.

Conference Banquet

Our toastmaster this year was Lemuel J. Peet, former State Conservationist for the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. Peet, in his usual capable and friendly way, guided the program smoothly so that everyone had a pleasant evening.

B. Frank Myott, who was a State ASC Committeeman from 1955 to 1958, was the speaker of the evening. His colored slides and vivid description of his recent trip to Venezuela, sponsored by Farmers and World Affairs, were greatly enjoyed by the group.

Others at the head table were:

Robert Branon, Commissioner of Agriculture and Mrs. Branon
 Mrs. B. Frank Myott
 Mrs. Lemuel J. Peet
 Keith Wallace, President, Vermont State Farm Bureau
 Everett H. F. Felber, Director, Farmer Programs Division, ASCS
 Bruce Whitenight, Deputy Director, Northeast Area, ASCS
 Richard A. Moore, Chairman, State ASC Committee, and Mrs. Moore
 J. Paul Bonneau, State ASC Committeeman, and Mrs. Bonneau
 Morris E. LaFrance, State ASC Committeeman, and Mrs. LaFrance

Although all were sorry that a previous engagement prevented Governor Hoff from attending the banquet, they were glad to have Commissioner Branon bring greetings from the State Government in his place.

A quartet composed of four young women from the Greater Burlington area provided the evening's music. Well-named "Four in Accord," they presented several selections and then led the group in novelty arrangements of two well-known songs. The guests appreciated their harmony and charm, as well as the pert remarks of their leader, Mrs. Shirley Lonergan, and all wished that the musical interlude could have been longer.

This year the Hotel Vermont staff provided a buffet featuring London Broil as the hot dish. The attractive serving table and delicious food were enjoyed by 124 guests, one of the largest banquets in recent years.

At the end of the evening the toastmaster presented the floral centerpiece on the head table to Mrs. Moore in appreciation of her serving as the conference hostess.

ASCS Alumni

A special table at the banquet was reserved for State alumni and their wives. Former State Committeemen present this year were:

Mr. & Mrs. Hugh Evans, Brattleboro
 Edson E. Gifford, Sr., East Bethel
 Mr. & Mrs. B. Frank Myott, Enosburg Falls
 Mr. & Mrs. Raymond Rowley, Milton

State Office alumni present were Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Doane and Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Dodge. Mr. Doane is a former fieldman and Mrs. Dodge will be remembered as Marcia Tudhope.

Visitors from Cooperating Offices

We were pleased that the following representatives of cooperating agencies could attend sessions of the conference:

Merton Ashton, Deputy Director, Selective Service System, Montpelier
 Joseph Bornstein, Agricultural Engineer, UVM, Burlington
 Edward Bouton, Executive Secretary, State Soil Conservation Council, Montpelier
 Jack Davis, Coordinator, White River RC&D Project, Randolph
 Robert Deemer, U. S. Forest Service, Rutland
 Robert Douglas, Swanton Lime Works, Inc., Swanton
 Robert Farrington, Vermont Forest Service, Montpelier
 Raymond Foulds, Extension Forester, UVM, Burlington
 David Grimwood, State Conservationist, SCS, Burlington
 Maurie Heins, Extension Information Office, UVM, Burlington
 Richard Holmes, Deputy Director, Civil Defense, Montpelier
 Edward Kehoe, Commissioner, Fish and Game Service, Montpelier
 Jerry McIntosh, Extension Soil-Plant Relationship Specialist, UVM, Burlington
 S. M. Martinetti, Farm Placement Supervisor, Department of Employment Security, Montpelier
 Charles Mason, Farm Family Project, Montpelier
 Paul S. Newcomb, U. S. Forest Service, Rutland
 Theodore Pawlowski, Soil Conservation Service, Burlington
 Charles Rich, Swanton Lime Works, Inc., Swanton
 Howard Stark, Vermont Associated Lime Industries, Inc., Winooski
 William Stone, Supervisor and Program Leader, Agriculture and Resource Development, Extension Service, UVM, Burlington
 Vernon Tuxbury, Extension Rural Defense Information Specialist, UVM, Burlington
 Leroy Ware, Vermont Co-op Council, Richmond
 Robert Williams, Commissioner, Department of Forests and Parks, Montpelier
 Keith Wortman, District Supervisor, Farmers Home Administration, Montpelier

Museum Tour

On the afternoon of the first day a tour of the Fleming Museum at the University of Vermont was arranged for the ladies attending the conference. Mrs. Margit Holzinger, Curator, conducted the tour and her explanations and comments provided many sidelights which made the many exhibits even more interesting. Mrs. Richard Moore, wife of the State Committee Chairman, served as conference hostess, greeted the ladies on their arrival, and made arrangements for transportation. She was assisted in these duties by Mrs. J. Paul Bonneau and Mrs. Morris E. LaFrance, wives of State Committee members.

Length-of-Service Awards

Certificates and pins recognizing the years of service rendered were presented to the following county personnel:

County Committeemen

15 Years

Robert Kilborn, Orleans County

10 Years

Basil H. Hill, Essex County
 Arthur Bensenhaver, Windham County

County Office Managers

30 Years

John J. DeVito, Bennington County
Dorothy Howard, Chittenden County
Mildred Bell, Essex County
Hazel K. Hoyt, Lamoille County

First County Office Manager Retires

Mrs. Mildred R. Murphy was honored on the occasion of her retirement, after serving as Caledonia County Office Manager since November of 1942, nearly 25 years. Mrs. Murphy is the first county office manager in Vermont to retire from her position.

The State Executive Director presented her with a Certificate of Appreciation for her many years of service to the organization and to the farmers of Caledonia County. Mrs. Murphy also received a purse from her co-workers, presented by Miss Mildred Bell, President of the Vermont Association of ASCS County Office Employees.

Exhibits

Charts and numerous pictures of ASCS activities and personnel were on display in the Roof Garden where the general sessions of the conference were held.

Publicity

The Burlington Free Press carried several articles on conference activities, both before and during the conference.

Station WCAX-TV presented several pictures of conference sessions as part of their daily local newscasts.

We are indebted to Mrs. Maurie Heins of the Vermont Extension Information Office for her constant attendance and excellent work in handling publicity for us.

A Message from the Vice President

ASCS personnel were honored by the following telegram from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey to Chairman Moore:

"Congratulations to you and your organization in Vermont for the job you are doing in administering the farm program which is so important to our entire economy. Since I remain close to agriculture, I follow the operations of our programs with much interest and am gratified by the job that our State and county committees are doing. I trust that your State Conference will be a success. Kind personal regards and best wishes to all."

